

STEREOTYPE EDITION.

PC 2109
.M68
1843
Copy 2

Brother Jonathan Monthly Library, No. 3.

109
1843 (copy 2)
FRENCH

10,944

5-1/2 airbambles

WITHOUT

A MASTER.

In Six Easy Lessons.

FIRST AMERICAN, FROM THE FOURTH BRUSSELS EDITION.

New-York:

WILSON AND COMPANY, BROTHER JONATHAN PRESS.

This number of the Monthly Library contains Two Sheets. Postage, under 100 miles, three cents;
over 100 miles, five cents. Price 25 cents per copy.

THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN

NEW YORK

1887

A

COURSE OF LESSONS

IN THE

FRENCH LANGUAGE,

ON THE

ROBERTSONIAN METHOD;

INTENDED FOR

THE USE OF PERSONS STUDYING THE LANGUAGE WITHOUT
A TEACHER.

BY

Expanded
A. H. MONTEITH, ESQ.,

HON. MEMB. OF THE W. L. C.

FIRST AMERICAN, FROM THE FOURTH BRUSSELS EDITION.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY WILSON & COMPANY,
162 NASSAU STREET.

SOLD ALSO BY BURGESS AND STRINGER, 222 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.—ZEIBER AND CO.,
LEDGER BUILDINGS, PHILADELPHIA.—REDDING AND CO., STATE ST., BOSTON.—
WILLIAM TAYLOR, BALTIMORE.—GEORGE JONES, ALBANY.—BRAVO AND MORGAN,
MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE, NEW ORLEANS.—A. HEAD, CHARLESTON, S. C.—M. BOULLE-
MET, MOBILE, ALA.—S. A. HOLMES, AUGUSTA, GA.—G. S. TAINTOR, NATCHEZ, MISS.—
W. N. HALDEMAN, LOUISVILLE, KY.—J. B. LOAK, UTICA, N. Y.—JOHN JONES, ROCH-
ESTER, N. Y.—L. SMITH, POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.—J. ROBERTSON, SYRACUSE, N. Y.—
JOHN GREEN, PROVIDENCE, R. I.—WOODWARD AND MATHEWS, ST. LOUIS, MO.

MDCCCXLIII.

PC 2109

.M 68

1843

Copy 2

P R E F A C E.

THE object of the present course of lessons is to give persons disposed to study the French language without the aid of a teacher, some directions for their guidance, and to furnish them with a model whereon their studies may be advantageously prosecuted.

In order the more perfectly to supply the part of a teacher, a comprehensive, and at the same time practical view of pronunciation has been given, together with such elucidations of the sounds peculiarly French as will enable the learner to enunciate them with a sufficient degree of accuracy.

The prevalent notion that it is impossible to acquire French without a teacher, appears to have arisen from the lugubrious attempts of grammarians who have undertaken to explain the pronunciation of the language. No human intellect could possibly digest, and bring to bear on the words of the language, the pages of unintelligible rules and ill-organized observations they have amassed with this view. In the present course of lessons this prolixity has been carefully avoided; and while no useless detail has been introduced, every essential point is fully explained, and brought prominently before the observation of the learner. French words being written in most cases exactly as they should be pronounced, there is nothing to prevent the acquisition of their pronunciation by theory; and the generality of persons who study the language, by relying upon the ear, that deceives them at every step, and by losing sight of the theory, neglect the only certain means whereby they can acquire a really good pronunciation.

A great many otherwise intelligent persons run away with the idea that French may be acquired by going to France; this is an excessively vulgar notion, and means that the language may be acquired by intuition, or some other magical process. Whether in France or England, persons of mature years will not acquire the language thoroughly without a diligent and assiduous study of its principles; hundreds of pounds have been expended by Englishmen, both in this country and in France, with a view to acquire French, without having attained the desired object: all the wealth of the Indies, and all the teachers in Christendom, will not suffice for the purpose, where diligence or intelligence is wanting on the part of the learner himself. On the other hand, any Englishman of ordinary capacity, whether in his own country or in France, whether with or without a teacher, if he set his mind earnestly to the subject, may, in the course of twelve or eighteen months, become perfectly conversant with the language.

The present short course of lessons, besides containing a full *exposé* of the pronunciation, comprises an explanation of the chief difficulties the learner has to encounter, and will enable the diligent student, without the aid of any kind of oral instruction whatever, to see his way clearly into the *materiel* of the language.

IN EXCHANGE

BDS. ANTH.

MJS 06

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

LESSON FIRST.

READING.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin. et dirent, "Nous avons faim, qu'un de nous aille acheter de quoi manger;" un d'eux se détacha et alla dans l'intention de leur apporter de quoi faire un repas.

Before the learner can read the above, he must first be taught the pronunciation of the words and their meaning. We shall therefore first place under each word such a combination of letters as may convey a notion of its sound to the English student. Afterward we shall exhibit the meaning of each word in a literal translation of the entire passage. This done, the learner will be able to translate into English and to pronounce the text of the lesson, if not with absolute accuracy, at least with a sufficiently close approximation. It is not indeed to be expected that the learner should be altogether perfect the first step he makes in a language. A portion of each lesson will be reserved to point out the true pronunciation of such French sounds as can not be exactly exhibited by a combination of letters.

The following is a repetition of our text, with the pronunciation of the words, as also their euphonic connexion one with another, according as the language is read and spoken by a well-educated *native of Paris*.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin,
Trwa wa-ee-a-shair troo-vair-t — *un** trai-zor dan lair she-mîn,

* For the pronunciation of the combinations *an*, *en*, *in*, *on*, and *un*, marked in *italics*, we refer the student to the article Pronunciation, page 12.

et dirent, " Nous avons faim, qu'un de nous aille acheter de
 ai deer, Noo-z av-on fin, kun d noo-z ah-ye ash-tai d
 quoi manger ;" un d'eux se détacha et alla dans
 kwa man-shay un d ai s day-tash-a ai al-la dan
 l'intention de leur apporter de quoi faire un repas.
 in-ten-see-on d lair ap-por-tai d kwa fair un re-pa.

In order to read the above as it ought to be, the learner should deal with the verbal pronunciation we have given just as if the combinations of letters that represent the French sounds were so many English words. There are no unheard-of sounds in French that require the features to be distorted in enunciating them. The learner must avoid all straining, all effort, if he desires to speak French correctly.

Before leaving this part of the subject we may observe, that a little attention to the pronunciation now will be worth more than a hundred times the amount of labor afterward; the same words will occur over and over again throughout this and the lessons that are to follow, so that a correct pronunciation at the outset will be of the greatest utility.

The sign \cup we have used, indicates that the words or letters it joins are to be pronounced as one word, and the sign $-$ over the *ai* signifies that these letters should be pronounced with a more open sound than usual.

TRANSLATION.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin, et
 Three travellers found a treasure in their road, and
 dirent, " Nous avons faim, qu'un de nous aille
 said, " We have hunger, that one of us may go (let one of us go)
 acheter de quoi manger ;" un d'eux se détacha
 .to buy of what (whereof) to eat;" one of them himself detached
 et alla dans l'intention de leur apporter de quoi
 and went in the intention of to them to bring of what (whereof)
 faire un repas.
 to make a repast.

Aided by the above translation the student may read into good English the text itself. And now that the meaning of the words, as well as their pronunciation are understood, the learner should accustom himself to reading the French aloud; this exercise will familiarize the ear with a correct enunciation of the words, and serve to impress them more firmly on the memory.

VOCABULARY.

As it is essential to the march of our method that the learner should be perfectly familiar with every French word introduced into a lesson, both as regards its general meaning and precise logical value, we shall range all the words with their various translations in separate columns, so that he may be enabled to test his proficiency in this particular. This may be done advantageously in the following manner: cover over with a card the English column, and translate each French word aloud; verifying this translation by removing the card from the translation given of it. After all the French words have been turned into English in this way, cover over the French column of words, and translate in the same manner the English words into French. This exercise should be repeated until all the English words can be rendered into French, and the French words into English with perfect facility.

Trois . . .	three	de . . .	of
voyageurs . . .	travellers	aille . . .	may go
trouvèrent . . .	found	acheter . . .	to buy
un . . .	{ a	quoi . . .	what
	{ one	manger . . .	to eat
trésor . . .	treasure	eux . . .	them
dans . . .	in	se . . .	{ himself
leur . . .	{ their		{ themselves
	{ to them	détacha . . .	detached
chemin . . .	road	alla . . .	went
et . . .	and	la . . .	the
dirent . . .	said	intention . . .	intention
nous . . .	{ we	apporter . . .	to bring
	{ us	faire . . .	{ to make
avons . . .	have		{ to do
faim . . .	hunger	repas . . .	repast
que . . .	{ that		
	{ what		

It will be observed that some of the French words have two significations, as in the case of the word *leur*, meaning in one case *their*, and in another, *to them*; the reason of this will be explained under the head CONSTRUCTION.

PHRASES.

Not only must the learner, who desires to profit by our lessons, make himself familiar with each word in a sentence, but he must also observe carefully how words are made up into sentences, and the difference be-

In order to converse in French it will be necessary to become familiar with the following words used in asking questions :—

Où	<i>where</i>	pronounced	like oo in <i>good</i> .	
Quand	<i>when</i>	“	<i>kang</i> .	
Qui	<i>who</i>	“	<i>kee</i> .	
Que	<i>what</i>	“	<i>ki</i> .	{ giving the letters the sound they have in the English word <i>kill</i> .
Ils	<i>they</i>	“	<i>cel</i> .	
Il	<i>he</i>	“	<i>cel</i> .	
Pour	<i>for</i>	“	<i>poor</i> .	{ giving the o's the sound they have in the word <i>good</i> .
Le	<i>the</i> before words in the singular pronounced like the letter <i>l</i> .			
Les	<i>the</i> before words in the plural pronounced like <i>le</i> in the word <i>let</i> .			
Oui	<i>yes</i>	pronounced	<i>we</i> .	
Non	<i>no</i>	“	<i>nong</i> .	
Monsieur	<i>sir</i>	“	<i>mos-yai</i> .*	

The pronunciation and meaning of all the other words introduced into the conversation have been already given. If then the previous exercises have been carefully gone over, there can be no difficulty with this. The learner should pronounce each question aloud, and proceed with the answers in the same manner as with the translation of the words and sentences.

Que trouvèrent les trois voyageurs ?	Un trésor.
Les trois voyageurs trouvèrent-ils un trésor ?	Oui, Monsieur.
Où ?	Dans leur chemin.
Trouvèrent-ils de quoi manger ?	Non, Monsieur.
Que dirent-ils ?	Ils dirent " nous avons faim."
Quand ?	Quand ils trouvèrent un trésor.
Dirent-ils " nous avons de quoi manger ?"	Non, Monsieur.
Dirent-ils " nous avons de quoi faire un repas ?"	Non, Monsieur.

* We are always disposed to laugh when we hear an Englishman pronounce the word "Monsieur," he generally makes such a mess of it. It seems impossible to teach this sound by the ear: not two, in twenty Englishmen, who have been taught the language by a *master*, pronounce it correctly, and yet there is no French sound more easily depicted to the eye. We have heard persons who had been one, two, nay three years under tutelage, pronounce the word as if written *moo-soo*; now nothing could be more grating to the ear of a well-educated Frenchman than to hear himself addressed by such a barbarism as *moo-soo*. The word *monsieur* is pronounced as if written *mos-yai*, and the plural *messieurs* as if written *mes-yai*; could anything be plainer than this ?

of the article would be employed in French under these three circumstances.

We may observe here, that nouns in English are said to be of three genders: the word *man* is said to be of the masculine gender; the word *woman* is said to be of the feminine gender; and the word *treasure* is said to be in the neuter, or no gender: this is a natural division, but somehow or other it does not happen to be a grammatical one. In French there is no such thing as a *neuter* gender; all the nouns of the language must either be masculine or feminine; the word *trésor*, for instance, is said to be masculine, and the word *intention* is said to be feminine. As a different form of the article must be used in each of these cases, it becomes a matter of some moment to know to which of the two genders any particular word may belong, we shall therefore give rules that will enable the learner to distinguish the gender of nouns when they become necessary. In the meantime the gender of the words in the lesson must be judged by the form of the article that exists before them; thus *trésor* will be recognised as masculine, since *le* stands before it. The learner, then, must take care always to render "the treasure" into French, by *le trésor*: it would be a blunder to write or pronounce *la trésor*. There is no difficulty about words in the plural, the same form of the article is always before them; thus we say *les intentions* and *les voyageurs*, although, as we have seen, the former of these words is feminine, and the latter masculine.

II.

Un d'eux	One of them.
Dans l'intention	In the intention.
Qu'un de nous aille	Let one of us go.

When the words *le* or *la*, the, *que*, that, or *de*, of, come before another word beginning with a vowel, the *a* of the one and the *e*'s of the others are invariably cut off. This is done in order to avoid the too frequent recurrence of two vowels, these little words being very much used in French. The student, therefore, in writing, must take care when he has the two words *de* and *eux* for example coming together, to cut off the *e* of the *de*, and be careful at the same time to supply its place with an apostrophe, as in the sentences given above.

III.

Qu'un de nous aille	}	Let one of us go.
That one of us may go	}	

The above phrase occurring in our text, exhibits a very common mode

of expression. The sentence "qu'un de nous aille" is incomplete; the words "il faut," *it is necessary*, being understood. The phrase entire would be "il faut qu'un de nous aille," *it is necessary that one of us go, or one of us must go*. It is however the defective form of the phrase, the form which appears in our text, that is generally employed, and consequently that is the form the student ought to imitate when he has a similar expression to turn into French. Being imperfect, the phrase when translated literally into English does not exhibit the sense it is meant to convey. The best way to deal with such a phrase, is to consider it entire, without regarding individually the words of which it is composed, and look upon it as equivalent to a certain other phrase in English; deal with it, in short, in the same manner as if it were a single word. We can not approve of the manner adopted in a grammar of some note,* of explaining this difficulty by saying, that "*que*" supplies an ellipsis, and *ergo*, that *que* is equal to *let*; such a solution of the difficulty is likely to beget a notion in the mind of the learner that *que*, in French, has the signification of the English word *let*, while these two words have not, nor can they logically have, any meaning in common.

A similar kind of construction to that under consideration occurs in the Latin language; we find frequently the Roman writers employing the subjunctive as an imperative, for instance in the well-known verse of Virgil—

"———— illâ *se jactet* in aulâ
Æolus, et clauso ventorum carcere *regnet*."

"Qu' Eole *se contente* de régner sur ses rochers, et d'exercer son pouvoir dans ses sombres cachots."

"*Let Æolus vaunt himself* in his own hall, and *let him reign* in the closed prison of the winds."

Here we have a similar construction in Latin to that of "qu'un de nous aille" in French; but think of a "tyro" translating the Latin relative *qui* by *let*! We shall have occasion to revert to the logic of the construction of "qu'un de nous aille" in a future lesson. In the meantime it will be sufficient for the guidance of the student to say, that when he has an English phrase to translate, beginning with *let*, implying a command, he must set out in French with the word *que*. Two or three phrases of this kind will be introduced into the exercise on composition, in order to habituate the learner to this mode of expression.

* Grammar of the French Language, by J. C. Delille.

IV.

Que trouvèrent les trois voyageurs? }	What <i>did</i> the three travellers
What found the three travellers? }	find?

Que dirent-ils? }	What <i>did</i> they say?
What said they? }	

Dirent-ils? }	<i>Did</i> they say?
Said they? }	

In English there are two ways of asking a question; with the auxiliary word *did*, or without it: a question can either be put in the form, "Did they say so and so," or, "Said they so and so." In French there is no such word as *did*, that can be made use of in this way, the French therefore can not put a question in the first of these forms, and consequently are obliged to employ the second. In framing a question, the student must always bear in mind, that the word *did* has no equivalent in French—he must bear in mind that there are two manners of asking a question in English, one of which accords with the French idiom, and may be translated literally: but that the other can not be rendered word for word into French. It will be observed that in English the word *did* is merely a sign of the past time, and may be dispensed with by using a past tense of the verb itself. In the phrases, "Did the travellers find a treasure;" and, "Found the travellers a treasure;" the words "did find" in the one, and the word "found" in the other, are precisely equivalent.

Some English interrogative phrases containing the word *did* will be introduced into the exercises under the head of *Composition*. To translate these correctly into French, the learner must, as we have said, bear in mind that the question *did he go?* can be put in a shape without the *did*, as, *went he?* and that this last form of a question alone can be rendered literally into French.

V.

Les voyageurs trouvèrent-ils un	} Found the travellers a treasure?
The travellers found <i>they</i> a	
trésor?	
treasure?	

Les voyageurs dirent-ils, "Nous	} Said the travellers, "We have a treasure?"
The travellers said <i>they</i> , "We	
avons un trésor?"	
have a treasure?"	

Quand les voyageurs trouvèrent-ils	} When found the travellers a treasure?
When the travellers found <i>they</i>	
un trésor?	
a treasure?	

We have said last section, that the English have two ways of asking a question; one with the word *did*, as "Did three travellers find a treasure," and another without this auxiliary, as "Found three travellers a treasure." We also said that the first of these forms can not be rendered into French, there being no such auxiliary as *did* in the language, and consequently that the second of the two must always be translated.

It is the practice also in French interrogations, to say "Three travellers found *they* so and so," "Three travellers said *they* so and so;" instead of the English form, "Found three travellers so and so," "Said three travellers so and so." These last phrases, indeed, were they translated literally, would not be French.

It will be also observed by the sentences given above, that in questions, the pronoun and the verb must be connected with a line drawn betwixt them.

VI.

Où alla-t-il ?

Where did he go ?

When in a question the verb ends in a vowel followed by the pronoun *il*, he, the letter *t* is inserted between. This is done in order to prevent the hiatus in pronunciation caused by two vowels coming together. It may be asked why is a *t* used for this purpose, in preference to any other consonant, when an *n*, an *m*, or a *b*, would answer the purpose, so far as euphony is concerned, quite as well. In order to answer this question, we must trace the language back to its source. We find in Latin, the parent language, that all the third persons of verbs end in a *t*, and we know that in French the *t* is only wanted when a question is asked in the third person. The phrase *alla-t-il*, did he go, is in Latin, word for word, *ibat ille*; in the Latin word we have a *t*. And although the *t* has been dropped in the affirmative form of the phrase in French, it makes its appearance again when wanted. The *t* moreover is still retained in the third person singular of some verbs, as *il dit*, *he said*, *il avait*, *he had*, and in cases where it has been lost, it appears again when a question is asked, as if to remind us that the language of Gaul is still the language of Cæsar.

PRONUNCIATION.

NASAL N.

When the letter *n*, preceded by any of the vowels, occurs before another consonant, it has what is termed a nasal sound, being partially

enunciated through the nose. The existence of this sound in the pronunciation of French, has given rise to a notion among the English, that the French are very much addicted to speaking through their noses, but nothing could be more erroneous; the truth of the matter is that, if this peculiarity abounds in any language more than another, it is in English that it predominates. In the English words, *clung*, *flung*, *swung*, *rang*, *fang*, *swang*, there is a nasal sound, and a very decided one too; it only differs from the French in being more nasal! A Frenchman has the greatest possible difficulty in acquiring a correct pronunciation of the words we have named, for the unique reason that they are a great deal more nasal than his own. The French nasal sound is exceedingly nice, and must be enunciated with the utmost softness; it possesses more the characteristics of a simple aspiration, than of the unequivocal nasal of the English *ng*. The prevailing vice of beginners in French lies in the pronunciation of the nasal *n*; they either for the most part sound it too harshly, or do not enunciate it at all—faults that it is the special object of these remarks to guard them against.

It may also be observed that in English the nasal sound is variously modified, according to the vowel that precedes the *ng*; thus the *ung* of the word *stung*, and the *ang* of the word *swang*, are totally different in their inflection. We are led to mention this because beginners very generally make no distinction between the French sound of *in* and *en*, while in reality the difference between these two combinations is as marked as between their equivalents, *ang* and *ing*, in English.

Keeping in view, that the difference between the English and French nasal sounds, is that the former partake more abundantly of the nasal character, and that the latter must be formed by a slight aspiration, the nasal sound being almost imperceptible, the following table will enable the learner to pronounce the nasal *n* in all cases correctly:

<i>an</i>	} are pronounced like <i>ang</i> in the word <i>clang</i> , giving the <i>a</i> the sound of that letter in the English word <i>father</i> .
<i>en</i>	

<i>in</i>	is pronounced	like <i>eng</i> or <i>ang</i> in the word <i>anger</i> , as that word is usually pronounced, that is, as if it were written <i>enger</i> .
-----------	---------------	--

<i>on</i>	"	like <i>ong</i> in song.
<i>un</i>	"	like <i>ung</i> in the word <i>sung</i> .

When *n* is followed by another *n*, the nasal sound is lost; double *n* has the same sound as in English, but when it comes before any of the

other consonants, it is *always* nasal. It will therefore be seen from the table we have given, that the word "intention," in the lesson, should be pronounced as if written eng-tang-see-ong, the English nasal sounds of these letters being of course considerably modified.

The student must bear in mind that *n* is only nasal when followed by a consonant; when followed by a vowel, *n* has the same sound as in English.

The same remarks apply also to the letter *m*; the pronunciation of this letter resembles in every particular that of *n*.

COMPOSITION.

The text of our present lesson, though it be short, illustrates a great many points in the structure of the French language. We have noticed a few of these under the head *Construction*, and have exhibited the others by a comparison of the English and the French sentences that occur in the passage under the head *Phrases*. The student may now put the knowledge the text has opened to him into practice, by a little exercise in composition. We give a few phrases and sentences in English to be rendered into French. In order to translate these, the French words that have already appeared in the lesson, alone are necessary; all that the student has to do, in order to go through this exercise correctly, is to bear in mind the structure of the sentences contained in the text. We shall give a translation of these phrases in the next lesson, so that the learner may verify the accuracy of his version.

We have.

We have a treasure.

We have the wherewith.

We have the wherewithal to make a repast.

We have the wherewith to buy some meat.

Have we?

Have we anything to eat?

Have we wherewithal to buy a repast?

Have we anything to do (to make)?

Are we hungry?

What have we?

Have we a meal?

Let one of us go.

Let one of them go.

Let him go and buy wherewithal to make a repast.

Let one of us go and make a repast.

Let the traveller go.

They said, "We have a treasure."

They said, "We are hungry."

They said, "We have wherewithal to make a repast."

They found something to eat.

They found the road.

We have the treasure.

We have a meal.

We are hungry.

One of us.

They said to us, "We are hungry."

They found us in the way.

We have *their* treasure.

They found *their* treasure.

They found *their* way.

They told *them* to bring the treasure.

They told <i>them</i> to buy something to eat.	He departed.
They said to <i>them</i> , "We are hungry."	When did he depart?
He went to buy <i>them</i> wherewithal to make a repast.	Why did he depart?
He went to make them a road.	Who departed?
Did they say?	They found a treasure.
Did they say, "We have wherewithal to make a repast?"	When did they find a treasure?
Did they say, "Let one of us go?"	Why did they find a treasure?
Did they find their road?	Where did they find a treasure?
Did they find a treasure?	Where did they find us?
Did they find wherewithal to make a repast?	They said, "We are hungry."
Did he go?	Did they say, "We are hungry?"
Did he depart?	Who said, "We are hungry?"
	He went.
	Did he go?
	Who went?
	When did he go?
	Why did he go?

All these phrases the student will be able to render correctly into French, if he has paid attention to the construction of the text, and our observations upon it. This exercise will not only serve as an introduction to writing French, but will tend also to impress the structure and idiomatical peculiarities of the sentences it contains on his memory, and thus a basis will be formed whereon the structure of the language may rest. The student will now have read, spoken, and written, a little French, and thus will have obtained a more extended notion of the language than if he had been turning over the pages of a *grammar*, with a master, for a twelvemonth. Each successive lesson will strengthen and augment the knowledge of the language the learner may now be supposed to have attained.

LESSON SECOND.

READING.

REPETITION.

The following exercise in reading consists of a translation of the sentences given in the last lesson under the head COMPOSITION, as an exercise in writing French. The pronunciation and meaning of the words have already been given, so that the learner should be able to read and translate the whole without hesitation.

Nous avons. Nous avons un trésor. Nous avons de quoi. Nous avons de quoi faire un repas. Nous avons de quoi acheter de la viande. Avons-nous ? Avons-nous de quoi manger ? Avons-nous de quoi acheter pour un repas ? Avons-nous de quoi faire ? Avons-nous faim ? Qu'avons-nous ? Avons-nous un repas ? Qu'un de nous aille. Qu'un d'eux aille. Qu'il aille acheter de quoi faire un repas. Qu'un de nous aille faire un repas. Que le voyageur aille. Ils dirent nous avons un trésor. Ils dirent "nous avons faim." Ils dirent "nous avons de quoi faire un repas." Ils trouvèrent de quoi manger. Ils trouvèrent le chemin. Nous avons le trésor. Nous avons un repas. Nous avons faim. Un de nous. Ils nous dirent "nous

avons faim." Ils nous trouvèrent dans le chemin. Nous avons leur trésor. Ils trouvèrent leur trésor. Ils trouvèrent leur chemin. Ils leur dirent d'apporter le trésor. Ils leur dirent d'acheter de quoi manger. Ils leur dirent " nous avons faim." Il alla leur acheter de quoi faire un repas. Il alla leur faire un chemin. Dirent-ils ? Dirent-ils " nous avons de quoi faire un repas ?" Dirent-ils " qu'un de nous aille ?" Trouvèrent-ils leur chemin ? Trouvèrent-ils un trésor ? Trouvèrent-ils de quoi faire un repas ? Alla-t-il ? Se détacha-t-il ? Il se détacha. Quand se détacha-t-il ? Pourquoi se détacha-t-il ? Qui se détacha ? Ils trouvèrent un trésor. Quand trouvèrent-ils un trésor ? Pourquoi trouvèrent-ils un trésor ? Où trouvèrent-ils un trésor ? Où nous trouvèrent-ils ? Ils dirent " nous avons faim." Dirent-ils " nous avons faim ?" Qui dit " nous avons faim ?" Il alla. Alla-t-il ? Qui alla ? Quand alla-t-il ? Pourquoi alla-t-il ?

Mais chemin faisant, il dit en lui-même, il faut que j'empoisonne la viande afin que mes deux camarades meurent en la mangeant, et que je jouisse du trésor moi seul. Il exécuta son dessein et mit du poison dans ce qu'il avait apporté à manger.

In order that the learner may read, translate, and understand the above, we shall, as in the case of the text given in the previous lesson, proceed to give first the pronunciation of the words, as also their euphonic connexion, and then their signification.

Mais	chemin	faisant,	il	dit	en	lui-même,	il	faut
May	she-min	fe-zan,	eel	dee-t	en	lüee* maim,	eel	fo

* For the pronunciation of the letter *u*, where we have marked it with an accent thus (ü), we refer the student to the head PRONUNCIATION, page 26, of the present lesson.

que j'empoisonne la viande, afin que mes deux camarades
 ki sh en-pwa-son la vee-and, afin ki mai day ka-ma-rad
 meurent en la mangeant, et que je jouisse du trésor moi
 mair-t en la man-shan, ai ki i shoo-ees dū trai-zor mwa
 seul. Il exécuta son dessein et mit du poison dans ce
 saïl. Eel exe-kū-ta son d-sin ai mee dū pwa-zon dan s
 qu'il avait apporté à manger.
 k-eel av-ai-t ap-por-tai á man-shay.

In order to read the above correctly, the learner must bear in mind what we said in the last lesson, under the head PRONUNCIATION, about the nasal sound. We continue to mark the *n* with its accompanying vowel, when it is nasal, in *italics*, so that this most important matter may not be neglected. We can not too strongly impress upon the learner the necessity of his attention to the pronunciation we have given of the words in the text, and their euphonic connexion. The same words will be repeated over and over again in the exercises that are to follow, so that on the amount of attention paid at the outset will depend the learner's accuracy throughout the lesson.

TRANSLATION.

Mais	chemin	faisant	il	dit	en	lui-même,	il
But	road	making (going along)	he	said	in	himself.	it

faut que j'empoisonne la viande afin que mes deux
 is necessary that I may poison the meat to end (in order) that my two
 camarades meurent en la mangeant, et que je jouisse du
 companions may die in it eating, and that I may enjoy of the
 trésor moi seul. Il exécuta son dessein et mit du poison
 treasure me alone. He executed his design and put of the poison
 dans ce qu'il avait apporté à manger.
 in what he had brought to to eat.

The student can now read and pronounce the new portion of text; the next thing is to turn the words acquired to a practical account.

VOCABULARY.

We again range the words of the text opposite their English equivalents, in order that the student may test his knowledge of them before entering upon the more essential exercises of the lesson.

Mais	but	mangeant	eating
chemin	road	et	and
faisant	making	jouisse	may enjoy
il	{ he	du	of the
	{ it	trésor	treasure
dit	said	moi	me
en	in	seul	alone
lui-même	himself	exécuta	executed
faut	is necessary	son	his
que	that	dessein	design
je	I	mit	put
empoisonne	poison	du	of the
la	the	poison	poison
viande	meat	dans	into
afin	in order	ce que	what
mes	my	avait	had
deux	two	apporté	brought
camarades	companions	à	to
meurent	may die	manger	to eat

PHRASES.

The value of each word being known, the meanings of the sentences have next to be observed. As we have had occasion to remark under this head in the preceding lesson, it sometimes happens that combinations of words have acquired a meaning they do not exhibit when translated literally; thus *chemin faisant* is, when translated into English, word for word, *road making*; but the two words together are in French employed to signify *going along*, just as the phrases *making way* and *going ahead* are employed in English occasionally to express a similar notion. In considering the phrases, therefore, the power of the words collectively must be regarded more than their individual meaning.

Mais	But
Chemin faisant	Going along
Il dit en lui-même	He said to himself
Il faut que j'empoisonne la viande	I must poison the meat
Afin que	In order that
Mes deux camarades meurent	My two companions may die
En la mangeant	In eating it
Et que	And that
Je jouisse moi seul du trésor	I alone may enjoy the treasure
Il exécuta son dessein	He executed his design
Et mit du poison	And put poison
Dans ce que	In what
Il avait apporté à manger	He had brought to eat.

CONVERSATION.

As in the preceding lesson, we shall now proceed to a conversation on the subject involved in the text of the present lesson. It will be necessary for the student to bear in mind the words given as an introduction to the previous colloquial exercise, in addition to which the following will have to be acquired :—

Madame, *Madam*, pronounced *Madam* } giving the *a*'s the sound they
have in the word *part*.

Cela, *that*, “ *sla*.

Des, *of the*, “ *de* } giving the *de* the sound these
letters have in the English
word *debt*.

Ses, *his* “ *se* } like *se* in the English word
sent.

Que dit un des voyageurs ? . . .	Il faut que j'empoisonne la viande.
A qui dit-il cela ? . . .	A lui-même.
Quand ? . . .	Chemin faisant.
Qui dit, il faut que j'empoisonne la viande ?	Un des trois voyageurs.
Quand dit-il cela ? . . .	Chemin faisant.
Pourquoi faut-il que le voyageur empoisonne la viande ?	Afin que ses deux camarades meurent en la mangeant.
Le voyageur dit-il, il faut que j'empoisonne mes camarades ?	Non, Madame.
Dit-il, il faut que je jouisse du trésor moi seul ?	Oui, Madame.
Avait-il trois camarades ? . . .	Non, Madame.
Avait-il deux camarades ? . . .	Oui, Madame.
Qui avait deux camarades ? . . .	Un des trois voyageurs.
Pourquoi faut-il que ses camarades meurent ?	Afin qu'il jouisse seul du trésor.
Qu'avait-il apporté à manger ? . . .	De la viande.
Avait-il apporté de la viande ? . . .	Oui, Madame.
Avait-il le trésor ? . . .	Non, Madame.
Qui avait le trésor ? . . .	Ses deux camarades.
Qu'avait un des trois voyageurs ?	Un dessein.
Exécuta-t-il son dessein ? . . .	Oui, Madame.
Qu'exécuta un des trois voyageurs ?	Il exécuta son dessein.
Avait-il apporté de quoi manger ?	Oui, Madame.
Avait-il apporté le trésor ?	Non, Madame.

Dans quoi un des trois voyageurs mit-il du poison ?	Dans ce qu'il avait apporté à man- ger.
Avait-il apporté de la viande ?	Oui, Madame.
Mit-il du poison dans la viande qu'il avait apporté à manger ?	Oui, Madame.
Pourquoi ?	Afin que ses deux camarades mou- russent en la mangeant, et qu'il jouisse seul du trésor.
Quand mit-il du poison dans ce qu'il avait apporté à manger.	Chemin faisant.

CONSTRUCTION.

Under this head we shall continue to bring into view the points of the text that illustrate the general structure of the language. These remarks, as we stated in last lesson, are intended to guide and facilitate the learner in writing French.

VII.

Il faut que j'empoisonne la viande. I must poison the meat.

In our progress we shall occasionally fall in with a French word that has no corresponding word in the English language, and sometimes we shall in the same way have to deal with an English word that can not be rendered into French by any single word of that language; this is the case with the English word *must* in the sentence before us. There is no single word in French that is precisely equivalent to the English *must*: and as this word *must* is very much employed in English, it becomes to the learner a matter of some importance to know how a sentence in which *must* occurs, may be rendered correctly into French—a difficulty that our text by chance amply illustrates. We find in the sentence quoted above, that *I must* is represented in the French sentence by *il faut que je*, and it is by these four words arranged as we see them, that *I must* is most usually rendered in French.

The essential word of the equivalent for the English *I must*, is *faut*, and it will be seen from the translation of the text, that this word *faut* is equivalent to the two English words *is necessary*; so that the French phrase *il faut que je*, conveying the idea of *I must*, is literally in English, *it is necessary that I*.

The learner, therefore, in order to render *I must* in French, has to translate literally the phrase *it is necessary that I*, bearing in mind that the single word *faut* is equivalent to the two English words *is necessary*.

In the same way when *you must, we must, he must, or they must*, have to be rendered into French, a similar process is to be gone through, substituting for the *je* the pronouns equivalent to *you, we, he, and they*; thus in order to say, *he must poison the meat*, the phrase, *it is necessary that he may poison the meat* will have to be taken and translated literally; the result will be, *il faut qu'il empoisonne la viande*, and so in all similar cases. We shall introduce some phrases of this kind into the exercise on Composition, which we shall expect the learner, aided by the foregoing remarks, to render correctly into French.

It will no doubt occur to the observing student, that "it is necessary that he may poison the meat," is rather a clumsy way of saying "he must poison the meat," and most certainly such is the case. The French are as sensible of this defect in their language as an Englishman can be, and in order to remedy the evil, the words "*il faut*" are occasionally omitted in such phrases, the other part of the sentence being made to answer the purpose. An instance of this kind of abbreviation occurred in the text of our last lesson, where we have the phrase "one of us must go" rendered by "*qu'un de nous aille*;" the words "*il faut*" *it is necessary*, being entirely suppressed. We stated in speaking of this sentence, Section III. of our last lesson, that the words "*il faut*" were frequently omitted in such expressions, and the fact of the contracted form being found in our text may be cited as a proof that the abbreviated form of such sentences is employed by the best writers in the language. We would suggest the learner to refer back to our previous observations on this construction, before reading the next section.

VIII.

Pourquoi faut-il que le voyageur Why must the traveller poison his
empoisonne ses camarades? companions?

The above phrase occurring in the exercise on Conversation, exhibits to us the manner of dealing with the English *must* when the word occurs in an interrogation. Translated literally the phrase in question appears as follows:—

Pourquoi	faut-il	que	le	voyageur	empoisonne	ses
Why	is necessary	that	the	traveller	may poison	his

camarades?
companions?

Here it will be observed that *faut-il*, literally signifies "is it neces-

sary," just as we have seen the literal equivalent for *il faut* is "it is necessary."

It is possible and usual to omit the words *il faut* in expressing a command, but when a question is asked, the case is altered, for in an interrogation *il faut* is not so easily disposed of. It is perfectly good French to say, "Qu'un de nous aille," instead of "Il faut qu'un de nous aille," but it is quite impossible to ask a question with such an assemblage of words as "Qu'un de nous aille." In order to say, "Must one of us go," the *faut-il* can not be dispensed with, the phrase entire is required, and must be written "Faut-il qu'un de nous aille;" in such a case *il faut* becomes an indispensable adjunct.

In the previous section we have noticed the exceedingly clumsy substitute that exists in the French language for the English word *must*, and we have stated that the means adopted to remedy the evil is by omitting the words *il faut*, but we have seen that *il faut* can not always be so dispensed with, and is absolutely necessary in an interrogation. In order to say in French, "Must we eat?" the phrase "Is it necessary that we may eat" would have to be employed; decidedly too long and round about to answer the purpose: brevity is the soul of social converse, and in the intercourse of common life long heavy locutions like this are totally inadmissible. The expedient adapted to abridge such expressions is to suppress the pronoun and the *que*, employing only the indispensable *faut-il* with the simple form of the verb; thus instead of saying "Faut-il que nous mangions," *must we eat*, the following construction is usually employed:—

Faut-il manger ? . . . Must we eat ?

It will be observed that this phrase, *Faut-il manger*, implies nothing more than, *Is it necessary to eat?* and consequently may be employed to express, *must I eat?* or *must you eat?* as well as *must we eat?* When, however, a question of this kind is to be put in the third person, no abbreviation is practicable; thus, *must he go?* *must they die?* will have to be rendered in French, *faut-il qu'il aille?* *faut-il qu'ils meurent?* We shall introduce into the exercise on Composition some English interrogative phrases containing the word *must*, to be rendered into French, in order that the learner may be habituated to this kind of construction.

IX.

Le trésor	The treasure.
La viande	The meat.

In the first section of the remarks, under the head CONSTRUCTION, we have stated that all words in the French language are either MASCULINE or FEMININE, and also that *the* is rendered by *le* before masculine words, and by *la* before feminine words. The learner must bear in mind, when he has to render the English article *the* into French, that he can not use the words *la* or *le* indiscriminately; it very often happens that a word in French has one meaning when *le* is before it, and another when *la* is before it: thus *le manche* is in English, *the broomstick*, and *la manche* is *the English Channel*. Now if an Englishman were to say, speaking of having been to France, "I went across *le manche*," instead of saying *la manche*, a Frenchman would naturally suppose him to mean that he went to France on a broomstick: this would be an awkward mistake for an elderly lady to make.

X.

En <i>la</i> mangeant	.	.	.	In eating <i>it</i> .
-----------------------	---	---	---	-----------------------

The learner, from what we have said in the last and previous sections, will now know how to proceed when he has the word *the* to render into French; we have said that *the* is to be translated in the following manner:—

- Before a noun in the masculine gender, by *le*.
- Before a noun in the feminine gender, by *la*.
- Before a noun in the plural number, by *les*.

But it must not be supposed from this, that the words, *le*, *la*, and *les*, always signify in French *the*; it is true that *the* is rendered in French by *le*, *la*, *les*, but it is not true that *le*, *la*, and *les*, are always to be rendered in English by *the*, as we see from the sentence quoted above, in the text where the word *la* has the signification of the English word *it*.

When the words *le*, *la*, and *les*, occur before a noun, they are equivalent to the English article *the*; but when they occur before a verb, they are no longer articles but pronouns, and will have to be translated into English in the following manner:

le before a verb by *him* or *it*.

la before a verb by *her* or *it*.

les before a verb by *them*.

In the sentence before us the word *mangeant* is a verb, and consequently the *la* before it must be rendered into English by the word *it*, since it refers to the word *meat*.

This diversity of the meaning in the words *le*, *la*, and *les*, arising from their position in a sentence, requires to be particularly noted; as otherwise they are likely to cause a great deal of trouble to the beginner, and are apt even to mislead persons who have attained some proficiency in the language.

Properly speaking, the words *le* and *la* mean simply *him* and *her*, because everything in French being either masculine or feminine, the word *it* has no existence in the language.

In the phrase given above, in speaking of the meat, the French say, in eating, *her*, and not eating *it*. Just as the English say in speaking of a steamboat, "She sails well;" so the French *him* or *her* all objects whatever. The fact that all objects in nature are considered masculine or feminine may very likely give rise to this question in the mind of the learner: "Why is it that there are only two genders in French?" In answering this question we may observe that most persons who have written French grammars, assert that it is impossible to teach theoretically the pronunciation of the language; this may be perfectly true, so far as they are individually concerned, but instead of ascribing the impossibility to their own incompetency, they usually ascribe it to some impenetrable difficulty in the subject itself. In the same way when such a point is to be resolved as the question before us, we have nothing but mystery and perplexity.

A very slight knowledge of the history of the language is sufficient to account for the use in French of two genders only: when the Franks overran Gaul, the inhabitants spoke Latin, and in order to understand the people they had conquered, they were obliged to learn their language; but, as may be readily supposed, the conquerers did not trouble themselves much about the niceties of the Latin terminations, and the distinctions of gender depending upon them, they were content with being able to make themselves understood, and beyond what was necessary to effect this, disregarded the subtilties of the Latin syntax; they were obliged, however, to make a distinction between male and female, and gradually embraced under these two heads, all the words that had hitherto been considered as of the neuter gender; thus it is simply from the circum-

stance of the Franks being a more warlike, than a learned people, that two genders only exist in the language.

In rendering the English word *it* into French, the learner must observe whether it relates to a masculine or a feminine noun; for instance, if in the phrase, "They found it," the word *it* refers to the treasure, the phrase will have to be rendered in French—

Ils LE trouvèrent.

But if the word *it* refers to the meat, the phrase must be—

Ils LA trouvèrent.

It will be remembered that these pronouns are placed before, and not as in English, after the verb.

PRONUNCIATION.

THE CHARACTERISTIC.

There exists in nearly all the modern languages, some particular sound that is rarely, if at all, made use of in English; these sounds may be considered by the English as characteristic of the languages to which they belong. Viewing in this way the French sounds as they stand in relation to those of the English language, the sound of the vowel *u* may be called the French characteristic.

The nearest approximation to the French sound of the vowel *u*, made use of in English, with which we are acquainted, occurs in the word *doing*, when that word is quickly pronounced, as it usually is, especially when used with other words in a sentence; in such a case the sound of the *o* in the word, blending with the *i* of the termination *ing*, produces exactly the sound given by the French to the vowel *u*. If then the learner pronounces rapidly the word *doing* two or three times over, and stops short at *doi*, he will pronounce the French word *du* almost as accurately as a native of Paris. He must bear in mind, however, that the sound of the *o* in *do* is not the French sound of *u*. It is only when the *o* of that word is blended with the *i* that follows it in the word *doing* that it resembles the French *u*.

In English the vowel *u* has three sounds; that in *tube*, another in *tub*, and a third in such words as *rude*. In French the vowel *u* has only one sound, which must ALWAYS be given to it, except when it is associated with another vowel; there are three words in the lesson in which this

letter stands alone, these are the words *du*, *lui*, and *exécute*. The learner has been shown how to pronounce *du*, and he must now endeavor to transfer the sound of the *u* in this word to those in the other two. By observing carefully the sound between the *d* and the *ng* of the word *doing*, when quickly pronounced, the learner may form such a conception of the sound as will enable him to pronounce the French *u* in all cases correctly. We may repeat that he must carefully avoid the sound of the *o* in the word *do*, that being the sound given to the French *u* by persons who, having studied the language under a *master*, have been led to rely more upon their ear, than upon their comprehension.

We are satisfied that, with a little attention to the direction we have given, the pronunciation of the *u* may be accurately acquired. At all events, such a pronunciation of the letter may be obtained as will approach much nearer its exact sound than that given to it by the natives of some of the provinces of France itself. We have heard a well-educated native of Somersetshire, pronounce the English word *much*, as if it were written "mooch." In Lancashire, the word is pronounced as if written "meech."* In Killarney, the word would be, we think, pronounced as if written "mitch." In the same way, natives of France vary in their inflection of the letter *u*, and an Englishman pronouncing the *u*, according to the conception of the sound he may form from the illustration we have given of it, will approach infinitely nearer the sound a Parisian gives the letter than a native of Burgundy, Gascony, or indeed of any other province in France remote from the capital.

COMPOSITION.

Translating from English into French is a valuable auxiliary in the study of the language, especially when the subjects given for translation are within the grasp of the learner, and are useful in themselves; qualities which we think the phrases we have selected will be found to possess. An exercise of this kind will bring the peculiarities of structure more distinctly to view, and aid in impressing them upon the mind. Our text has enabled us to illustrate some of the leading features of the language, with which the student will be greatly benefited by being familiar. No better means of effecting this can be devised, than by translating their English equivalents into French. The learner ought not therefore to neglect this exercise. We shall give in the next lesson a translation in French of the following phrases, so that the learner may see whether he has himself rendered them correctly or not.

* Conversations in the Lancashire Dialect, by Tim Bobbin.

I must poison the meat.
 I must poison my companions.
 I must enjoy the treasure.
 My companions must die.
 My two companions must die.
 He must enjoy the treasure alone.
 The travellers must die.
 They must die.
 He must poison the meat.
 He must poison the travellers.
 He must poison one of his companions.
 Must the traveller poison the meat?
 Must one of the three travellers poison his companions?
 Must the travellers die?
 Must my two companions die?
 Must one of the travellers poison the meat?
 Must his two companions die?
 We must eat.
 The meat must be eaten.
 We must eat the treasure.
 The travellers must be eaten.
 The poison must be taken.
 Poison must be bought.
 Meat must be bought.
 We must buy something to eat.
 Must we eat?
 Must we eat the meat?
 Must the treasure be eaten?
 Must we eat the travellers?
 Must we eat the poison?
 Must I eat my companions?
 Must poison be bought?
 Must meat be bought?
 Must we buy something to eat?
 I must poison the meat, in order that my two companions may die when they eat *it*.
 I must poison *it*.
 I must poison *them*.
 He put *it* in the meat. (The poison.)
 He put *it* in the poison. (The meat.)
 He said *it*.
 It must be taken. (The poison.)

It must be eaten. (The meat.)
 We must eat *them*.
 Must I poison *it*?
 Must I poison *them*?
 Did he put *it* in the meat?
 Did he say *it*?
 Must *it* be eaten? (The meat.)
 Must *it* be taken? (The poison.)
 Must we eat *them*?
 Must it be bought?
 He executed his design.
 Who executed a design?
 Where did he execute his design?
 When did he execute it?
 Going along, one of the three travellers said, "I must poison my two companions?"
 Going along, a traveller put poison in the meat, and said, "My two companions must die on eating *it*."
 Two travellers, on their journey found some meat on the road and said, "Gentlemen (Messieurs), we must eat *it*."
 He must eat his companions.
 Why must he eat his companions?
 When must he eat his companions?
 A Gentleman (un Monsieur) put meat in the poison.
 What did he put in the poison?
 Why did he put meat in the poison?
 When did he put it in?
 I must poison *the lady*. (Madame.)
 When must I poison the lady?
 Why must I poison her?
 Whom must I poison?
 We must eat some meat.
 Must we eat the meat?
 Why must we eat it?
 When must we eat it?
 Must my two companions die?
 The three travellers must die.
 Why must they die?
 When must they die?
 They must die on eating the meat that one of them brought to make a repast.

When the learner has rendered these phrases, he will have become familiar with some of the chief difficulties he has to encounter. In the next lesson we shall have to speak of some other leading features in the construction of the language.

LESSON THIRD.

READING.

REPETITION.

IL faut que j'empoisonne la viande. Il faut que j'empoisonne mes camarades. Il faut que je jouisse du trésor. Il faut que mes camarades meurent. Il faut que mes deux camarades meurent. Il faut qu'il jouisse seul du trésor. Il faut que les voyageurs meurent. Il faut qu'ils meurent. Il faut qu'il empoisonne la viande. Il faut qu'il empoisonne les voyageurs. Il faut qu'il empoisonne un de ses camarades. Faut-il que le voyageur empoisonne la viande? Faut-il qu'un des trois voyageurs empoisonne ses camarades? Faut-il que les voyageurs meurent? Faut-il que mes deux camarades meurent? Faut-il qu'un des voyageurs empoisonne la viande? Faut-il que ses deux camarades meurent? Il faut manger. Il faut manger la viande. Il faut manger le trésor. Il faut manger les voyageurs. Il faut manger le poison. Il faut acheter du poison. Il faut acheter de la viande. Il faut acheter de quoi manger. Faut-il manger? Faut-il manger la viande? Faut-il manger le trésor? Faut-il manger les voyageurs? Faut-il manger le poison? Faut-il manger mes camarades? Faut-il acheter du poison? Faut-il acheter de la viande? Faut-il acheter de quoi faire un repas?

Il faut que j'empoisonne la viande afin que mes deux camarades meurent en la mangeant. Il faut que je l'empoisonne. Il faut que je les empoisonne. Il le mit dans la viande Il la mit dans le poison. Il le dit. Il faut le

manger Il faut la manger. Il faut les manger. Faut-il que je l'empoisonne? Faut-il que je les empoisonne? Le mit-il dans la viande? Le dit-il? Faut-il la manger? Faut-il le manger? Faut-il les manger? Faut-il l'acheter? Il exécuta son dessein. Qui exécuta un dessein? Où l'exécuta-t-il? Quand l'exécuta-t-il? Chemin faisant un des trois voyageurs dit, "Il faut que j'empoisonne mes deux camarades." Chemin faisant un voyageur mit du poison dans la viande et dit, "Il faut que mes deux camarades meurent en la mangeant." Chemin faisant deux voyageurs trouvèrent de la viande dans leur chemin et dirent, "Messieurs, il faut la manger." Il faut manger ses camarades. Pourquoi faut-il manger ses camarades? Quand faut-il manger ses camarades? Un Monsieur mit de la viande dans le poison. Que mit-il dans le poison? Pourquoi mit-il de la viande dans le poison? Quand la mit-il? Il faut que j'empoisonne Madame. Quand faut-il que j'empoisonne Madame? Pourquoi faut-il que je l'empoisonne? Qui faut-il que j'empoisonne? Il faut manger de la viande. Faut-il manger la viande? Pourquoi faut-il la manger? Quand faut-il la manger? Faut-il que mes deux camarades meurent? Il faut que les trois voyageurs meurent? Pourquoi faut-il qu'ils meurent? Quand faut-il qu'ils meurent? Il faut qu'ils meurent en mangeant la viande qu'un d'eux a apportée pour faire un repas.

Mais les deux autres qui avaient conçu un semblable dessein contre lui pendant son absence, l'assassinèrent à son retour, et demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor. Après l'avoir tué ils mangèrent de la viande empoisonnée et moururent aussi tous deux.

In order that the learner may be able to read and pronounce the above, we shall have, as in the case of the two preceding sections of the text, to give first the pronunciation of the words, and then their meaning.

Mais les deux autres qui avaient conçu un semblable
 Mai lè* dāi-z o-ter kee av-ai kon-sū un sem-bla-bel
 dessein contre lui pendant son absence, l'assassinèrent à
 d-sin con-ter lū-ee pen-dan so-n ab-sens, la-sa-see-nèr-t a
 son retour, et demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor. Après
 son re-toor, ai d-mair-rèr lè mai-ter dū trai-zor. A-prè
 l'avoir tué ils mangèrent de la viande empoisonnée et
 lav-war tūé eel man-shair d la vee-and en-pwa-zon-né ai
 moururent aussi tous deux.
 moor-ūr-t o-see too dāi.

In reading the above the learner must bear in mind what we have said of the nasal sound in the first lesson, and what we have said of the vowel *u* in the second. We continue to represent the nasal sound by italics, and to place a short accent over the *u* when that letter has its pure sound. The nasal and the sound of the *u* are two very important features in French pronunciation, and habitual attention to what we have said of them will do more to perfect the learner in pronunciation than a twelvemonth with a *master*.

TRANSLATION.

Mais les deux autres qui avaient conçu un semblable
 But the two others who had conceived a similar
 dessein contre lui pendant son absence, l'assassinèrent à
 design against him during his absence, him assassinated at
 son retour, et demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor. Après
 his return, and remained the masters of the treasure. After,
 l'avoir tué ils mangèrent de la viande empoisonnée, et
 him to have killed they ate of the meat poisoned, and
 moururent aussi tous deux.
 died also all two (both).

* For the sound of the *e* we have accented thus *é* and thus *è*, see the article Pronunciation, page 39.

VOCABULARY.

The text of the present lesson consists of forty words, twenty of which have already appeared in the preceding sections, we shall therefore limit the vocabulary to the twenty new words, as the learner may be supposed to have got the others pretty well fixed on his memory already.

Autres . . .	others	demeurèrent . .	{ remained
avaient . . .	had		{ lived
conçu . . .	conceived	maîtres . . .	masters
semblable . . .	similar	après . . .	after
contre . . .	against	avoir . . .	to have
lui . . .	him	tué . . .	killed
pendant . . .	during	mangèrent . . .	ate
absence . . .	absence	empoisonnée . .	poisoned
assassinèrent . .	assassinated	moururent . . .	died
retour . . .	return	aussi . . .	also
		tous . . .	all

Of these twenty words, the greater part are mere modifications of those already seen: *avaient*, *had*, is the plural form of *avait* in the text of the preceding lesson; *mangèrent*, *ate*, is formed from the same root as *manger*, *to eat*; *moururent*, *died*, is from the same root as *meurent*, *die*. The principle operating these changes in the form of a verb will soon have to engage the learner's attention.

PHRASES.

Mais les deux autres . . .	But the two others
Qui avaient conçu un semblable dessein contre lui	Who had conceived a similar design against him
Pendant son absence . . .	During his absence
L'assassinèrent . . .	Assassinated him
A son retour . . .	On his return
Et demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor.	And remained masters of the treasure
Après l'avoir tué . . .	After having killed him
Ils mangèrent de viande empoisonnée.	They ate some of the poisoned meat
Et moururent aussi tous deux.	And they also both died

In comparing these sentences, the learner will observe that the English say, *poisoned meat*, and that the French reverse the English order of these two words, and say *meat poisoned*. It will also be observed, that the equivalents of the English words *all* and *two* are used in French

to signify *both* ; the reason of this is, that there is no single word equivalent to *both* in the French language.

CONVERSATION.

All the words introduced into the following exercise have already appeared, either in the text of the present, or in the conversation of the preceding lessons. Their meaning and pronunciation have consequently been already given.

Qu'avaient conçu les deux autres voyageurs ?	Un semblable dessein.
Qui avait conçu un semblable dessein ?	Les deux autres voyageurs.
Quand ?	Pendant l'absence de leur camarade.
Où ?	Dans le chemin.
Contre qui les deux autres voyageurs avaient-ils conçu un dessein ?	Contre leur camarade.
Qui avait le trésor ?	Les deux autres voyageurs.
Quand avaient-ils le trésor ? . . .	Pendant l'absence de leur camarade.
Qu'avaient les deux autres voyageurs pendant l'absence de leur camarade ?	Ils avaient le trésor.
Qui les deux voyageurs assassinèrent-ils ?	Ils assassinèrent leur camarade.
Où l'assassinèrent-ils ?	Dans le chemin.
Quand l'assassinèrent-ils ?	A son retour.
Pourquoi l'assassinèrent-ils ? . . .	Afin d'avoir le trésor pour eux seul.
Après l'avoir tué, demeurèrent-ils maîtres du trésor ?	Oui, Messieurs.
Qui demeura maître du trésor ?	Les deux autres voyageurs.
Les deux autres voyageurs mangèrent-ils leur camarade ?	Non, mais à son retour ils l'assassinèrent.
Après l'avoir tué, de quoi demeurèrent-ils les maîtres ?	Ils demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor et de la viande que leur camarade avait apportée à manger.
Qu'avait apporté un des voyageurs ?	Il avait apporté de la viande.
Avait-il empoisonné la viande ?	Oui, Messieurs, il l'avait empoisonnée.
Pourquoi avait-il empoisonné la viande ?	Afin que ses camarades mourussent en la mangeant.
Qu'avaient à manger les maîtres du trésor ?	Ils avaient de la viande
Qui avait de la viande à manger ?	Les maîtres du trésor.

Les maîtres du trésor mangèrent-ils la viande ?	Oui, ils la mangèrent.
Pourquoi la mangèrent-ils ? . . .	Ils avaient faim.
Qui avait faim ? . . .	Les trois voyageurs.
Qui avait empoisonné la viande ?	Un des trois voyageurs.
Qui la mangea ? . . .	Les deux autres.
Quand la mangèrent-ils ? . . .	Après avoir tué leur camarade.
Que mangèrent les deux autres après avoir tué leur camarade ?	Ils mangèrent de la viande empoisonnée.
Moururent-ils après avoir mangé la viande empoisonnée ?	Oui, Messieurs, ils moururent.
Les voyageurs moururent-ils tous les trois.	Oui, ils moururent tous.
Quand moururent les trois voyageurs ?	L'un après son retour, les deux autres après avoir mangé de la viande empoisonnée.
Où moururent-ils ? . . .	Dans le chemin.

CONSTRUCTION.

XI.

Après l'avoir tué . . .	After having killed <i>him</i> .
Ils l'assassinèrent . . .	They assassinated <i>him</i> .

Perhaps there is no difficulty more embarrassing to the learner, than that arising from the diversity of meaning peculiar to the little words *le* and *la*. We have already had occasion to remark, that *le* and *la* are sometimes to be rendered in English by *the*, and at other times by *him*, *her*, or *it*. Persons who have gone partially over a French grammar, are aware that *le* and *la* are articles, and so equivalent to the English word *the*; but not having pursued their studies far enough, are not acquainted with the pronominal signification of the words. They have in consequence associated *le* and *la* with the English word *the*, and the result of this association is, that they are confounded with the first page of any French author they attempt to translate. If any one, for instance, were to suppose that the *l'* in the phrases we have quoted above from our text, signified *the*, he could not possibly make sense of them. In translating, the meaning of such long words as *assassinèrent* may generally be guessed at, but the little words like *le* and *la* completely upset the partially initiated. We have stated (§ X.), for the guidance of the learner in this matter, that when *le* or *la* occur before a verb, they must be rendered in English by *him*, *her*, or *it*; and when they occur before a noun, are to be rendered in English by *the*; but it is only in this last

case that *le* and *la* signify *the*. In the phrase, *après l'avoir tué*, the word *avoir* is a verb; and according to what we have said, the *l'* must be rendered by one or other of the English pronouns *him*, *her*, or *it*, which of the three being judged from the context. We have quoted the two phrases, however, at the head of this article, not so much to illustrate the meanings of *le* and *la*, as to recall the attention of the learner to the manner he is to deal with the English words *him*, *her*, and *it*, when he has got to translate them into French. We have said elsewhere that there is no use for the word *it* in French. Everything is said to be *him* or *her*; thus the word *viande* being feminine, the English phrase *they ate it*, the pronoun *it* referring to the noun meat, would have to be rendered into French, *they ate her*; and in the same way in speaking of the treasure, the English phrase *they ate it*, would have to be rendered, *they ate him*, the word *trésor* being a masculine noun. It will be seen by the phrase, *ils l'assassinèrent*, that the pronoun *him* is represented by the word *le* abridged into *l'*, on account of the following vowel, according to the rule we gave § II. In the same way, *they assassinated her* would be in French, *ils l'assassinèrent*, exactly the same as the other, the *a* of the *la* being likewise subject to elision. When, however, the verb begins with a consonant, the distinction between *him* and *her* would be as apparent in French as it is in English; thus, *they ate him* would be *ils le mangèrent*, but *they ate her*, *ils la mangèrent*, the *le* and *la* in these cases not being subject to elision. The learner will also observe, that the English order of the words in such phrases is inverted in their French equivalents; for instead of saying, *they assassinated him*, we must say, *they him assassinated*, *ils l'assassinèrent*. We shall introduce into the exercise under the head COMPOSITION, some English phrases, containing *him*, *her*, and *it*, to be turned into French, in order to familiarize the learner with the pronomial use of *le* and *la*.

XII.

Mais les deux autres qui avaient	But the two others who had con
çu un semblable dessein	ceived a similar design against
contre lui, l'assassinèrent à son	him, assassinated him on his
retour.	return.

It will be observed from the above sentence, that besides the pronoun *le*, there is another French word equivalent to the English pronoun *him*, and that this word is *lui*. When in English the word *him* is the direct object of a transitive verb, such as killed, assassinated, ate, *him* is then ren-

dered by *le* : but when *him* or *her* is preceded by a preposition, then they must be rendered in French by *lui*. In our text, the word *contre*, against, is a preposition, and the word *him* following it, must in consequence be *lui* not *le* ; in the same way, *of him*, *to him*, *by him*, *for him*, must be rendered in French, *de lui*, *à lui*, and *pour lui*, and so in all cases where a preposition precedes, the word *him* has to be rendered by *lui*. This double translation of the word *him*, is one of the difficulties to be encountered in writing French, but a little attention to the nature of the words will enable the learner to judge whether he should employ *le* or *lui* in translating *him*.

XIII.

Il avait conçu un semblable dessein. He had conceived a similar design.

The letter *c* is pronounced in French exactly as it is in English, that is, like *s* before *e* and *i*, and like *k* before *a*, *o*, and *u*. It happens, however, that in some French verbs *c* must have its hissing sound before the last-named vowels ; when such is the case, a little mark called a *cedilla* is placed under the *c*, as in the word *conçu* in the text ; without the cedilla, this word would have to be pronounced *kon-kū*. In writing this word, the learner must take care therefore not to omit the cedilla.

XIV.

Après l'avoir tué . . . After having killed him.

In this phrase, the word *avoir* is in the infinitive mood, and literally signifies *to have*. The English, after all their prepositions, except *to*, are in the practice of employing the present participle ending in *ing* ; but in French, all the prepositions except *en* govern the infinitive mood of the verb ; thus we must say in French, *after to have*, *of to have*, *from to have*, *for to have*, &c., and not as in English, *after having*, *of having*, *from having*, *for having*. This is a very marked peculiarity, and exhibits one of the most striking differences in the construction of the two languages ; it would be very bad English to say *for to have*, and it would be absolute nonsense to say in French, *for having*. In rendering, therefore, such English phrases as—after having put poison in the meat, after having killed their companions, after having eaten the travellers, after having brought the poison—the learner must bear in mind that the French construction is, *après avoir mis du poison dans la viande*, after *to have* put the poison in the meat ; *après avoir tué leur camarade*, after *to have*

killed their companion ; après avoir mangé les voyageurs, after *to have* eaten the travellers ; après avoir apporté le poison, after *to have* brought the poison ; and so in all similar cases.

XV.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin, et dirent,	Three travellers found a treasure on their way, and said, “ <i>We are hungry.</i> ”
“ <i>Nous avons faim.</i> ”	

In the above sentence, the words *nous avons faim* are translated literally *we have hunger*, and this is the manner the English expression *we are hungry* must be rendered into French. In the same way, *we were hungry* would have to be rendered *we had hunger*. The English say, I have a headache, and I have a cold, and it would only be according to the analogy of their own language to say, I have hunger also ; however, since it happens that this is not the case, the learner must bear in mind the difference in this respect between the construction of his own and the French language. The English phrases, *he was hungry*, and *they were hungry*, will have to be rendered,

Il avait faim	.	.	He had hunger.
Ils avaient faim	.	.	They had hunger.

XVI.

Ils moururent *tous deux* . . . They both died.

We have already said, *chemin faisant*, that the English word *both* has no single equivalent in French, so that the notion of both has to be rendered in the latter language by a paraphrase. The word is most usually rendered by the phrase, *tous les deux*, *all the two*, but occasionally the article *les* is dropped, and the phrase assumes the form, *tous deux*, *all two*, as we have it in our text. It is very likely that they died all two, may sound somewhat odd in the ears of an Englishman, but it is only because he has not been used to it. The phrase, *they died all two*, is just as logical as *they died all three*, although the first appears very bad English, and the second very good. We mention this because the learner generally, when he meets with a construction that he is not familiar with, is very apt to suppose that there is some huge mystery at the bottom of it, when in reality it exists in his own language, and is as simple in itself as the construction of any other assemblage of words ; a little judgment exercised in the study of a language will dissipate a vast number of apparent difficulties of this nature. The learner has to bear in mind

that the word *both* is to be rendered by *all two, tous deux* in French, or when a greater degree of exactitude is wanted, by *all the two, tous les deux*.

In English, the word *both* may be put either before or after the verb ; it would be as correct to say, they both died, as to say, they died both. In French, however, the adverb can not be moved about in this way ; there is only one way of arranging the words in a phrase like this, that is by placing the adverb *tous deux* after the verb, as in the text.

PRONUNCIATION.

ACCENTED LETTERS.

The vowel *e* has altogether in French four sounds : in order to show when it should be pronounced in one and when in another manner, little marks called accents are employed. The following table exhibits the various sounds of the *e*, together with the manner in which they are distinguished one from another.

e with an acute accent thus *é*, is pronounced like *a* in the English word *mate*.

e with a grave accent thus *è*, is pronounced like *e* in the English word *best*.

e with a circumflex accent thus *ê*, is pronounced like *è*, but a little longer.

e without an accent is called the *e* mute, and is generally silent ; when pronounced it has the sound of *ea* in the English word *earth*.

From this table the learner will observe that when he meets with an *e* having an acute accent upon it thus *é*, he must pronounce it like the *a* in the English words *make, cake, bake* ; and when he meets with an *e* having the grave accent *è*, or the circumflex accent thus *ê*, he must pronounce it like *e* in the English words *press, dress, mess*. So far as the accented *e*'s are concerned there is no difficulty, the *é* and the *è* may be considered as two distinct letters of the French alphabet, each having its own sound and characteristic properties, while the *ê* may be called a long *è*, and considered as such. We should now advise the learner to go over the sections of the text, and pronounce the accented *e*'s according to the foregoing directions, without paying attention to the equivalents we have given of them in our verbal pronunciation ; in this manner the habit will be acquired of pronouncing the accented *e* correctly. We would also

here strongly impress upon the observation of the learner the necessity of ATTENTION; he has been accustomed from his infancy to associate the letter *e* with a set of sounds, many of which are totally different from the French sounds of the letter, he must therefore be watchful lest his inherent notions mislead him in the pronunciation of the French *e*. The accented *e*'s in French have only the sounds we have described; these must always be given them, otherwise the word in which they occur will be rendered unintelligible, and the sense or meaning of the speaker, consequently, totally obscured.

The *e* mute, as its name implies, so far as pronunciation is concerned, is a nonentity, it is a mere orthographic sign, not an absolute letter. There are some cases, however, in which it may be pronounced. The phrase *il se détacha*, occurring in our text, may be pronounced *eels détacha*, suppressing entirely the unaccented *e*, or the little word *se* may be pronounced distinctly, giving the *e* the shut sound of *ea* of the English word *earth*, as already stated. The pronunciation of the *e* mute is therefore quite arbitrary, depending entirely upon the taste or the style of the speaker. This unaccented *e* has given rise to much learned disquisition among writers of French grammars; they have contrived to discover in this simple matter the most insuperable difficulties, and the greatest possible amount of doubt and dubity. These perplexities are not said to consist in explaining the sound itself, that we have given is sufficiently precise, but in knowing when to pronounce the letter, and when to leave it entirely silent: one Frenchman,* who has written two very respectable duodecimo volumes to enlighten the English on this knotty point, after quoting a dozen pages of illustrations, says, "All these examples show rather than solve the difficulty; but it is impossible to give certain and invariable rules by which foreigners may be able to make so many nice distinctions, which depend greatly on the JUDGMENT of the speaker or reader, and are not always (*qq.* never) attended to by the natives themselves." Had this writer limited his treatise to this one passage, we conceive he would have acted wisely, for in this single sentence he has said all that need be said on the subject. The pronunciation of the *e* mute is admissable in an elevated style, but its pronunciation in colloquial intercourse would only be tolerated when the meaning of a word or the sense of a sentence would be obscured by its omission, or when great clearness of expression is required. In every instance where the unaccented *e* occurs in our text, it may be left entirely silent, and on the other hand, it might be in most cases slightly enunciated. The unaccented *e* is rarely pronounced in ordinary conversation, and very rarely silent in a

* Duvergers' Treatise on the French Pronunciation, Part I.

solemn discourse ; it might be pronounced at the Palais du Luxembourg, but would be silent within the precincts of the Tuileries.

The accents, besides being employed to point out the sounds of the *e*, are occasionally used to distinguish some words from certain other words resembling them in orthography, but differing materially in meaning ; thus the letter *a* in French without an accent is a verb, and is equivalent to the English word *has*, but *a* with a grave accent thus *à*, is a preposition, and signifies in English *to* or *at* ; and again, the adverb *où*, *where*, has a grave accent to distinguish it from the conjunction *ou*, *or*. The accents in these cases do not affect in any way the pronunciation of the letter over which they are placed, they are orthographic signs only.* The circumflex accent is used to mark the omission of an *s*. The word *maître* in the text is derived from the Latin word *maïster*, or according to the modern Latin spelling, *magister*, the Romans writing an *s*, though very probably they did not pronounce it. The older French writers wrote the word *maistre*, whence the English have obtained their word *master*, where the *s* is retained and the *i* dropped. The circumflex accent requires the voice to rest slightly on the letter whereon it is placed, in order to compensate for the omission of the *s*, as in the case of the *è* already described.

We have now explained the use and application of the accents in French, they only affect the pronunciation, in so far as the *e* is concerned ; we shall henceforth, in giving the pronunciation of the French words, leave the accented *e*'s to speak for themselves, as the learner may now be fairly supposed to know how to pronounce them.

COMPOSITION.

He had.	No, but they had three companions.
He had a treasure.	Who had three companions ?
Had he a treasure ?	The traveller who had the two intentions.
Who had a treasure ?	Who had the treasure ?
They had.	The two other travellers.
What had they ?	When they had the treasure, had they also their companion ?
They had a companion.	No, they had poisoned him.
Had they the meat ?	After the two others had poisoned their companion, what had they ?
They had the meat, two treasures, and three intentions.	
Had they three designs ?	

* And it may be useful to observe that the grave accent only is used in these cases, the acute accent is never employed merely to distinguish words.

They had the treasure and also the meat, but their companion had poisoned it.

When had their companion poisoned the meat?

He had poisoned the meat during the absence of his companions.

Who had conceived a design?

One of the travellers.

Against whom had he conceived a design?

Against the masters of the treasure.

After having conceived his design, did he execute it?

Yes, he executed his design.

The masters of the treasure, had they also conceived a design?

Yes, they had conceived a design against the treasure, and two others against their companions.

Who was hungry?

One of the travellers.

Had he anything to eat?

Were his two companions hungry?

Yes, but they had something to eat.

What had the two travellers to eat?

They had the treasure, the poisoned meat, and a companion to eat?

Where did the travellers live?

They lived at Paris.

When did the masters of the treasure live at Paris?

They lived at Paris after they had killed their companion.

Whom did the three travellers assassinate?

They assassinated two travellers and their companion.

Why did they assassinate their companion?

In order to have his treasure.

After having killed their companion, whom did they assassinate?

They assassinated the two other travellers.

Did they assassinate their companion after having killed the travellers?

No, they assassinated the travellers after having killed their companion.

Where did they assassinate their companion?

They assassinated him on the road.

Whom did they assassinate on the road?

They assassinated the masters of the treasure, the three travellers, and also their two companions.

They ate.

What did they eat?

They ate the treasure.

After having eaten the treasure, what did they eat?

They ate the meat.

After having eaten that, what did they eat?

They ate their companion.

After having eaten the treasure, the meat and their companion, what did they eat?

They ate two other companions.

Why did they eat their companions?

They were hungry.

After having eaten all their companions, what did they eat?

They ate each other (se).

They died.

Did all the three travellers die?

Yes, all the travellers died.

Did the masters of the treasure die also?

Yes, they both died.

When did the two travellers die?

After having killed and eaten their companion.

Where did the travellers die?

Two died at Paris, the other three died on the road.

During the absence of their comrade, the travellers ate each other.

After having killed some and poisoned others, the two travellers remained masters of the meat, but after having eaten it, they both died.

The masters of the treasure assassinated and ate their companion, but they both died also.

During the absence of their companion, the two others had eaten the treasure.

While the two travellers remained masters of the treasure, they had wherewithal to eat; but after having killed their companion, they both died of hunger.

One of the travellers, during the absence of the other two, had

conceived the design of eating the treasure, but the two others, on their return assassinated him.

After having killed their companion, the two others ate some poisoned meat as a refreshment.

The poison killed one of the travellers, the treasure killed all three.

After having eaten the treasure, the meat, and their companion, the three travellers died of hunger.

LESSON FOURTH.

READING.

REPETITION.

IL avait. Il avait un trésor. Avait-il un trésor? Qui avait un trésor? Ils avaient. Qu'avaient ils? Ils avaient un camarade. Avaient-ils la viande? Ils avaient la viande, deux trésors, et trois intentions. Avaient-ils trois desseins? Non, mais ils avaient trois camarades. Qui avait trois camarades? Le voyageur qui avait les deux intentions. Qui avait le trésor? Les deux autres voyageurs. Quand ils avaient le trésor avaient-ils aussi leur camarade? Non, ils l'avaient empoisonné. Après que les deux autres eurent empoisonné leur camarade, qu'avaient-ils? Ils avaient le trésor et la viande, mais leur camarade l'avait empoisonnée. Quand, leur camarade avait-il empoisonné la viande? Il avait empoisonné la viande pendant l'absence de ses camarades. Qui avait conçu un dessein? Un des voyageurs. Contre qui avait-il conçu un dessein? Contres les maîtres du trésor. Après avoir conçu son dessein l'exécuta-t-il? Oui, il exécuta son dessein. Les maîtres du trésor avaient-ils aussi conçu un dessein? Oui, ils avaient conçu un dessein contre le trésor et deux autres contre leurs camarades. Qui avait faim? Un des voyageurs. Avait-il de quoi

manger? Ses deux camarades avaient-ils faim? Oui, mais ils avaient de quoi manger. Qu'avaient les deux voyageurs à manger? Ils avaient à manger le trésor, de la viande empoisonnée, et un camarade. Où demeurèrent les trois voyageurs? Ils demeurèrent à Paris. Quand les maîtres du trésor demeurèrent-ils à Paris? Ils demeurèrent à Paris après avoir tué leur camarade. Qui, les trois voyageurs assassinèrent-ils? Ils assassinèrent deux voyageurs et leur camarade. Pourquoi assassinèrent-ils leur camarade? Afin d'avoir son trésor. Après avoir tué leur camarade qui assassinèrent-ils? Ils assassinèrent deux autres voyageurs. Assassinèrent-ils leur camarade après avoir tué les voyageurs? Non, ils assassinèrent les voyageurs après avoir tué leur camarade. Où assassinèrent-ils leur camarade? Ils l'assassinèrent dans le chemin. Qui assassinèrent-ils dans le chemin? Ils assassinèrent les maîtres du trésor, les trois voyageurs, et aussi leurs deux camarades.

Ils mangèrent. Que mangèrent-ils? Ils mangèrent le trésor. Après avoir mangé le trésor, que mangèrent-ils? Ils mangèrent la viande. Après avoir mangé cela, que mangèrent-ils? Ils mangèrent leur camarade. Après avoir mangé le trésor, la viande, et leur camarade, que mangèrent-ils? Ils mangèrent deux autres camarades. Pourquoi mangèrent-ils leurs camarades? Ils avaient faim. Après avoir mangé tous leurs camarades, que mangèrent-ils? Ils se mangèrent. Ils moururent. Les voyageurs moururent-ils tous les trois? Oui, tous les voyageurs moururent. Les maîtres du trésor moururent-ils aussi? Oui, ils moururent tous les deux. Quand les deux voyageurs moururent-ils? Après avoir tué et mangé leur camarade. Où moururent les voyageurs? Deux moururent à Paris, les trois autres dans le chemin. Pendant l'absence de leur camarade, les voyageurs se mangèrent les uns les autres. Après avoir tué les uns et empoisonné les autres,

les voyageurs demeurèrent maîtres de la viande, mais après l'avoir mangé ils moururent tous. Les maîtres du trésor assassinèrent et mangèrent leur camarade, mais tous les deux moururent aussi. Pendant l'absence de leur camarade les deux autres avaient mangé le trésor. Pendant que les deux voyageurs demeurèrent maîtres du trésor ils avaient de quoi manger, mais après avoir tué leur camarade ils moururent de faim tous les deux. Un des voyageurs pendant l'absence des deux autres avait conçu le dessein de manger le trésor, mais les deux autres à leur retour l'assassinèrent. Après avoir tué leur camarade, les deux autres mangèrent pour repas de la viande empoisonnée. Le poison avait tué un des voyageurs, le trésor avait tué les trois. Après avoir mangé le trésor, la viande, et leur camarade, les trois voyageurs moururent de faim.

Un philosophe passant par cet endroit-là, dit, voilà, quel est le monde! Voyez de quelle manière il a traité ces trois personnes. Malheur à celui qui lui demande des richesses.

In order that the learner may read the above, we shall, as in the case of the former portions of the text, proceed to give the pronunciation of the present section.

Un philosophe passant par cet endroit-là, dit, voilà,
Un fee-lo-sof pas-an par set en-drwa la, dee wa-la,
 quel est le monde! Voyez de quelle manière il a traité
kel ai l mond! Voyai d kel man-yèr eel a trai-té
 ces trois personnes. Malheur à celui qui lui demande des
sè trwa per-son. Mal-èur a s-lüee kee lüee d-mand dè*
 richesses.
ree-shès.

That the above may be read correctly, the learner must continue to bear in mind what has been said in the first lesson, of the nasal sound,

* For the pronunciation of the *eu*, see article Pronunciation, page 53.

which we continue to give in *italics*, as also what was said of the vowel *u* in the second lesson, and finally, the pronunciation of the accented *e*'s given in the third lesson. We would again urge the necessity of the learner sustaining his attention on these particular points; this is essential to an exact comprehension of the pronunciation of the words of the text, and consequently, on this depends the chief advantage the learner can hope to obtain from our lessons. The words of our text are not numerous, but they will serve as a key to the entire system of French pronunciation. The principles we shall lay down for the guidance of the learner in their pronunciation, if well fixed upon his memory, will enable him to pronounce, with a very few exceptions, every word in the language correctly.

TRANSLATION.

Un philosophe	passant	par	cet	endroit-là,	dit,	voilà,	quel
A philosopher	passing	by	that	place there,	said,	See there,	what
est le monde!	Voyez	de	quelle	manière	il a	traité	ces
is the world!	See	of	what	manner	it has	treated	these
trois personnes.	Malheur	à	celui	qui	lui	demande	des
three persons.	Wo	to	him	who	at it	asks	of the
richesses.							
riches.							

VOCABULARY.

The present portion of text consists of thirty-one words, ten of which have already been seen; and the five words, *philosophe*, *manière*, *passant*, *personnes*, and *richesses*, are nearly the same in form with their English equivalents. This vocabulary will therefore only consist of seventeen words.

Par	.	.	.	by	a	.	.	.	has
cet	.	.	.	{ this	traité	.	.	.	treated
				{ that	ces	.	.	.	{ these
endroit	.	.	.	place					{ those
là	.	.	.	there	malheur	.	.	.	{ wo
voilà	.	.	.	{ see there					{ misfortune
				{ behold	celui	.	.	.	{ he
quelle }				what					{ him
quel }	.	.	.		demande	.	.	.	{ ask
est	.	.	.	is					{ asks
le monde	.	.	.	the world					{ want
voyez	.	.	.	{ see	des	.	.	.	{ wants
				{ look					{ of the

CONVERSATION.

The following new words will be introduced into this exercise :

Mesdames, . . .	Ladies, pronounced <i>mèdam</i> .
Ce, . . .	<i>it</i> or <i>that</i> , „ <i>s</i> .
Pourquoi, . . .	<i>why</i> , „ <i>poor-kwa</i> .
Parce que, . . .	<i>because</i> , „ <i>pars-ky</i> .
Combien, . . .	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{how much,} \\ \text{how many,} \end{array} \right\}$ „ <i>kom-be-EN</i> .
Quelquefois, . . .	<i>sometimes</i> , „ <i>kelk-fwa</i> .
Au, . . .	<i>to the</i> , or <i>at the</i> „ <i>o</i> .
Était, . . .	<i>was</i> , „ <i>étai</i> .

In the reading exercise we have given *é* as the pronunciation of the word *est*, *is*. Above, we see that the little word *ce*, *it*, when denuded of its *e* mute has the sound of *s*; the learner will observe from this, that *est-ce*, *is it*, should be pronounced *ès*, and for the same reasons that *qu'est-ce*? *what is it*? should be pronounced *kès*. It may not be out of place to notice here a peculiar manner of putting in French the question, What is that? The learner is already aware that “what is that” should be rendered by *qu'est cela*? but though “*qu'est cela*” is very commonly used, the form most employed is *qu'est-ce que c'est que cela*? This phrase translated literally gives in English, *What is it that that is that that*? Such a multitude of *thats* looks like a very prosy way of saying, What is that? If, however, the learner has borne in mind the pronunciation we have given of the individual words composing *qu'est-ce que c'est que cela*? he will find the whole amount to *kesk-sek-sla*; the French interrogation in reality not requiring more time in its enunciation than the English *what is that*.

Qu'est-ce que dit un philosophe ?	Le philosophe dit, “Voilà, quel est le monde! Voyez de quelle manière il a traité ces trois personnes.”
Où dit-il cela ? . . .	Dans le chemin.
Quand le dit-il ? . . .	En passant à l'endroit où moururent les trois voyageurs.
Est-ce que le philosophe dit, “Voilà, les trois voyageurs?”	Non, mesdames.
Est-ce qu'il dit, “Voilà, ces trois personnes?”	Non, mesdames, mais il dit, “Voilà, de quelle manière le monde a traité ces trois personnes.”
Qui le monde a-t-il traité ? . . .	Trois personnes.
Qui est-ce qui a traité trois personnes ?	Le monde.

- Comment le monde a-t-il traité trois personnes ? D'une manière.
- Combien de personnes le monde a-t-il traité ? Il a traité trois personnes.
- Quelles trois personnes le monde a-t-il traité d'une manière ? Les trois voyageurs.
- Quels trois voyageurs ? Les voyageurs qui trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin.
- Pourquoi le monde a-t-il traité ces trois voyageurs d'une manière ? Parce qu'ils *lui* avaient demandé des richesses.
- Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un malheur d'après le philosophe ? C'est un malheur de demander des richesses au monde.
- Qui est-ce qui dit, malheur à celui qui demande des richesses au monde ? Un philosophe.
- Pourquoi dit-il cela ? Parce qu'il était philosophe.
- Le philosophe dit-il malheur à celui qui a des richesses ? Non, mesdames.
- Le philosophe dit-il que c'est un malheur d'avoir des richesses ? Non, mais il dit que c'est un malheur de les demander au monde.
- Pourquoi est-ce un malheur que de demander des richesses ? Parceque le philosophe le dit.
- Est-ce que le philosophe demande des richesses au monde ? Non, mesdames, il dit que c'est un malheur de les demander.
- Comment est-ce un malheur ? Voyez les trois voyageurs ils moururent après avoir demandé des richesses.
- Est-ce que les voyageurs demandèrent des richesses au monde ? Non, mais afin de les avoir ils assassinèrent leur camarade.
- Etait-ce à fin d'avoir ses richesses qu'ils assassinèrent leur camarade ? Oui, mesdames, et leur camarade afin d'avoir le trésor à lui seul mit du poison dans la viande qu'il avait apportée pour manger.
- Est-ce que toutes les personnes qui demandent des richesses au monde meurent ? Non, mesdames, mais quand ils assassinent leur camarades afin d'avoir leurs richesses, ils meurent quelquefois, voyez de quelle manière le monde a traité les trois voyageurs.
- De quelle manière le monde a-t-il traité les trois voyageurs ? Il les a traité de manière qu'ils moururent tous les trois.
- Qui est-ce qui dit cela ? Un philosophe.
- A qui dit-il cela ? A tout le monde.
- Etait-il à Paris quand il dit cela ? Non, il était à l'endroit où moururent les voyageurs.

CONSTRUCTION.

XVII.

Malheur à celui qui lui demande de Wo to him who asks it for riches.
richesses.

We have stated elsewhere, that the English pronouns *him*, *her*, and *it*, when the direct objects of a transitive verb, are rendered in French by *le* or *la* placed before the verb by which they are governed ; as

They ate <i>him</i>	Ils <i>le</i> mangèrent.
They ate <i>her</i>	Ils <i>la</i> mangèrent.

We have also stated that when the pronouns *him*, *her*, and *it*, are in English preceded by *to*, *at*, or any other preposition, they are to be rendered in French by *lui*, as

The travellers had conceived a de-	Les voyageurs avaient conçu un
sign <i>against</i> him.	dessein <i>contre</i> lui.
He said <i>into</i> himself	Il dit <i>en</i> lui-même.

In the sentence we have quoted at the head of this article, there is an apparent exception to the latter rule, since we have the word *him* rendered by *lui*, even although no preposition precedes the *him* in the English sentence. This arises from the mutability of the English language : it would be quite as good English to say, in speaking of the world, "Miserable is he who asks *at* it for riches," as to say, "Miserable is he who asks it for riches," only the English usually dispense with the preposition *at* in such cases, and hence the apparent departure from the rule we have given. Although the English can in this way say, "Who asks it," or, "Who asks *at* it," indiscriminately, the French language is not susceptible of any mutable property of this kind ; the preposition *à*, *to* or *at*, must, under such circumstances, invariably follow the verb *demande*, *to ask* ; we can not say in French, "Who asks it," the genius of the language requires us to say, "Who asks *at* it."

But we may be told that there is no *à* after the verb *demande* in the sentence we have quoted from the text : true, there is none in appearance ; it will be observed, however, that *lui* precedes the verb *demande* : in such a position, *lui* has the signification of *à lui* in any other,—*lui* before a verb is precisely equivalent to *à lui* placed after one. And we have the sentence *who asks it*, or *who asks at it*, rendered by *qui lui demande*, instead of *qui demande à lui*, because it is more consonant with the struc-

ture of the language to express *at it* by placing *lui* before the verb, than by placing *à lui* after it.

It is in matters of this kind that the judgment and observation of the learner might be advantageously exercised; the difficulties of the language are often hid in minute verbal modifications. The property that little words like *lui* possess of assuming a variety of meanings from a change of position, is also a source of great embarrassment to beginners. A little exertion of the perceptive faculties will do more for the learner in overcoming difficulties of this nature than the explanations of all the *masters* in the United Kingdom, who, nine cases in ten, are totally ignorant of the *animus* of such detail, and consequently are incapable of supplying the place of intellect to the student.

The words of the English language are not in general susceptible of a change of meaning from the change of position; but in French a word has often a very different signification in one set of words from that it has in another set. For instance, in the sentence—

<p>“Un d’eux se détacha et alla dans l’intention de leur apporter de quoi faire un repas,”</p>	<p>“One of them departed and went away in the intention of bring- ing to them wherewithal to make a meal,”</p>
--	--

the word *leur* occurs before a verb, and in that position is to be rendered in English by *to them*; but in the following sentence—

<p>“Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin,”</p>	<p>“Three travellers found a treasure on their way,”</p>
---	--

the word *leur* occurs before the noun *chemin*, and in that position has no longer the meaning of *to them*, but must be rendered in English by *their*. In beginning to read French, attention to points like these is of great importance: the exact value of the little words being known, the sense of a passage will always be clear; but until this is the case, the meaning of an author will ever appear obscure.

The sentence we have cited from our text illustrates two points to be noticed in writing French: first, that the verb *demander*, *to ask*, requires the preposition *à*, *to* or *at*, after it; and secondly, that *to* or *at*, *him*, *her*, or *it*, are rendered in French by placing the single word *lui* before a verb.

In the same sentence we observe the word *lui*, *him*, rendered by *celui* after a preposition as well as *lui*; the little particle *ce* prefixed to the *lui*, is equivalent to the English word *that*; *celui*, therefore, when reduced to its primeval elements, is equivalent to *that him*, the *ce* being obviously, in

this instance, appended to the *lui* merely for the sake of emphasis or euphony ; but be this as it may, *celui* must always be used under similar circumstances.

XVIII.

Un philosophe passant par cet en- A philosopher passing by that place.
droit-là.

We have already spoken fully of the various significations of the little words *le* and *la* : we have said, that when *le* or *la* occur before a noun, they are to be rendered in English by *the* ; as,

Nous avons *le* trésor . . . We have *the* treasure.
Nous avons *la* viande . . . We have *the* meat.

But when they occur before a verb, *le* and *la* are pronouns, and have to be rendered in English by *him*, *her*, or *it*.

Ils *la* mangèrent . . . They ate *her* or *it*.
Ils *le* mangèrent . . . They ate *him* or *it*.

It will be observed from the phrase we have quoted above from the text, that the word *la* has also to be rendered in English by the adverb *there*. When, however, this is the case, the *a* of the *la* is always marked with a grave accent, thus—*là*, as we see it in the text ; there can not, therefore, be any difficulty when *la* has the meaning *there*, since so visible a sign is used to point it out.

It may be asked, what business has the word *there* in the sentence under consideration ? This is another matter, and merits a little explanation. The English have the two little demonstrative words, *this* and *that* ;—*this* expressing an object spoken of to be near, and *that* expressing the object spoken of to be distant. The French have only the little particle *ce* to express both these relative positions of an object, and are consequently obliged to use some other word along with it to indicate more exactly the position of the object. The words used for this purpose are *ci*, *here*, and *là*, *there*. In order to express the English words *this* and *that*, the French are obliged to proceed in the following manner :

This world . . . ce monde-ci . . . This here world.
That treasure . . . ce trésor-là . . . That there treasure.
'This philosopher . . . ce philosophe-ci . . . This here philosopher.
That place . . . cet endroit-là . . . That there place.

The English occasionally employ a similar construction ; for instance,

in the phrases "Down that 'ere street," "Up that 'ere stair;" but we presume such phrases are exotics, as the word *'ere* or *there* is superfluous in such cases, the words *this* or *that* expressing precisely enough the relative position of the objects indicated. In French, however, it is necessary to say, "That there place," or rather, "That place there," and to employ the adverb *there* in all cases where the object spoken of is not present to the speaker; as otherwise, the *ce* would not, if employed alone, indicate with a sufficient degree of clearness the object spoken of.

It will be observed by the learner, that the adverb *là*, when employed in this way, is joined by a hyphen to the noun that precedes it, and also that *ce* is used before a word beginning with a consonant, and *cet* before words beginning with a vowel.

XIX.

Ils avaient	They had.
Il avait	He had.

The syllable *ent* at the end of verbs is never pronounced; it follows, that the word *avaient*, given above, should be pronounced as if written *av-ai*. We may also observe here, that final consonants are generally silent in French; so that the word *avait*, given above, should also be pronounced as if written *av-ai*. The two words *avait* and *avaient*, consequently, though differing in spelling, are pronounced exactly alike. The learner must, however, be careful always to write in the plural *avaient* and in the singular *avait*, as—

Ils avaient un trésor . . .	They had a treasure.
Il avait un trésor . . .	He had a treasure.

PRONUNCIATION.

DIPHTHONGS.

In the English language two vowels are occasionally used to represent a particular sound. The vowels *ou*, for instance, in the word *house*, represent a sound that neither the *o* nor the *u* resemble when pronounced individually. The same is the case in French: two vowels are used to represent some one particular sound of the language; and when two vowels are so employed, they are usually, though improperly called DIPHTHONGS. There are in French altogether five diphthongs, repre-

senting five distinct sounds of the language, of which the following is a table exhibiting the sounds they represent.

<i>oi</i> is pronounced like <i>wa</i> in the English word <i>wall</i> .					
<i>ai</i>	"	<i>ai</i>	"	"	<i>laid</i> .
<i>au</i>	"	<i>o</i>	"	"	<i>go</i> .
<i>ou</i>	"	<i>oo</i>	"	"	<i>good</i> .
<i>eu</i>	"	<i>ue</i>	"	"	<i>guest</i> .*

The only one of these diphthongs that requires a special notice is the *eu*. This diphthong is very much used in French, and most Frenchmen pronounce it precisely as the English do the *ue* in the word *guest*. The natives of Paris, however, give the *eu* a deeper inflection, somewhat approaching to *a* in the English word *bath*. Natives of London, in their pronunciation of such words as *birth*, *mirth*, give the *ir* a sound that is an exact counterpart to the Parisian inflection of the French *eu*; so that they have only to transfer this sound to the French *eu* in order to pronounce that diphthong in absolute perfection. Those among our students unacquainted with this local inflection of *ir*, must use the sound of *ue* in the word *guest*, which, though not the most elegant, is nevertheless the most common pronunciation of the diphthong.

The learner should now go over the words of the text, and pronounce the diphthongs in the manner pointed out in the table; by doing this carefully and attentively, he will make himself familiar with the signs and value of the combined vowels. When he has accomplished this, he will have gained an important point in his progress toward acquiring the French pronunciation; we say an important point, because the sounds of the five diphthongs may almost be said to constitute the language.

We would here guard the student against allowing the peculiarities of his own language to mislead and retard him in the study of French. In English, diphthongs are employed to represent single sounds as well as in French; but the sounds represented by a diphthong in the one language, is in most cases totally different from the sound it represents in the other. Unless therefore the learner be exceedingly careful at the outset, he will naturally give the English sound to the French diphthong, and the result will be a bad pronunciation of the latter. The English student of French must also guard himself against the unfixed notions as to the value of letters he has imbibed with his mother tongue. An English diphthong, like the chameleon, has the property of change, varying its sound to suit the convenience of the word in which it is used; take for an example of this, *ou* in the words

* In all other combinations of vowels beside these, each vowel has its own individual sound.

Cousin, court, could, count.

In each of these four words the *ou* has a perfectly distinct sound. Such a melange can not but superinduce a vague impression of the value of letters exceedingly pernicious in the study of spoken language. But having a variety of sounds is not the only noxious circumstance attendant on the English diphthongs—some of the sounds of one diphthong are occasionally given to another: the sound of *ou* in *could* is also possessed by the diphthong *oo* in *good*; the *ou* in *court* is claimed by the *oa* in *coarse*; and the *ou* in *count* is enjoyed by the *ow* in *cowherd*. It is a favorite theme with the writers of English grammars to say, that an Englishman should be well *grounded* in his own, before he studies another language; we must observe, that if another language be *grounded* upon the discordant materials we have been now speaking of, it could not stand, it would soon be swallowed up in the perplexities of its foundation, and very probably “leave not a wreck behind.” The mingling of the sounds peculiar both to the vowels and diphthongs of the English language, destroys the relation that should subsist between its orthography and pronunciation, and must at the same time destroy the impression that such should exist. Throughout the whole series of modern languages, except the English, and perhaps the Chinese, there is an intimate connexion between the orthography and the pronunciation. We do not know much either of the language or of the literature of the Esquimaux; but we know enough of both to be aware that greater consistency reigns between their written and spoken language than there is in English. The learner therefore must endeavor to divest his mind of the views of language he has obtained from his mother tongue, and replace them by some more stable notions as to the relation between sound and letter. He must not suppose that because a vowel, or a combination of vowels, has three or four different sounds in his own language, that such is the case in any other. The sounds we have given of the five French diphthongs in the preceding table, they ALWAYS have, under all circumstances, and in every position: in this particular the French pronunciation is not only fixed and immutable, but exceedingly clear and simple: nothing can be more easy than to pronounce the diphthongs correctly, and few points in the language are of more importance.

COMPOSITION.

He has.
What has he?
Has he wherewithal to eat?
Is he wealthy?
Yes, he is rich.

He has said.
What has he said?
Who said that?
When did he say that?
To whom did he say that?

He said that to the philosopher.
 He is.
 Who is he?
 Is he a philosopher?
 No, he is a traveller.
 Where is he?
 Is he here?
 No, he is there.
 Where is the philosopher?
 The philosopher is at Paris.
 What is that person?
 He is a traveller.
 What is that other person?
 It is the philosopher.
 He wants.
 What does he want?
 He wants wealth.
 Who is it that wants wealth?
 It is the philosopher.
 From whom does he want wealth?
 Why does he ask for riches?
 What does that traveller want?
 He wants a place.
 What place does he want?
 He wants the place where the three
 travellers died.
 He wants also a companion.
 The person he wants is at Paris.
 That is a pity.
 Look at that person going along
 there, that is a philosopher.
 There is a traveller from Paris.
 Look at that place.
 There is a misfortune.
 Here is another.
 Here is a traveller.
 There is another.
 This person is like that.
 This philosopher is similar to that.
 What a pity!
 What misfortunes!
 What wealth!
 What a philosopher!
 What a lot of travellers!
 What a crowd of people!
 What excessive politeness!
 What a place!
 There are riches!
 One of the travellers said to the oth-

er, we are hungry and must have
 something to eat, let one of us go
 and buy some meat.
 Is it a misfortune to be rich? said
 two travellers who died of hunger.
 A philosopher passing the place
 where the two travellers were
 eating (mangeaient) their com-
 panion, said: there is a manner
 of making a meal!
 The three travellers said that their
 two companions died after having
 poisoned a philosopher.
 We are unfortunate, said two trav-
 ellers who found a philosopher
 on their road.
 It is necessary to have something
 to eat, said a philosopher, after
 having killed his comrade.
 We have something to eat, said the
 two travellers when they found
 the poisoned meat.
 Now we are poisoned, said the
 two travellers, after having eaten
 the meat.
 How rich we are! said the three
 travellers when they found the
 treasure.
 We are hungry, said two persons
 when they ate their companion.
 We have a treasure, said two per-
 sons when they found a philoso-
 pher.
 What is wealth! said a passenger.
 There are three travellers who
 found a treasure, and afterward
 died of hunger.
 The world treated the three trav-
 ellers in such a manner that they
 all died.
 There is a way of going to work,
 said a philosopher, when the
 traveller put poison in the meat
 he had brought to eat.
 We must eat, said the two travellers
 when they ate their companion.
 Here we are masters of the treasure!
 said the two travellers after hav-
 ing killed their companion

LESSON FIFTH.

READING.

REPETITION.

IL a. Qu'a-t-il? A-t-il de quoi manger? A-t-il des richesses? Oui, il a des richesses. Il a dit. Qu'a-t-il dit? Qui a dit cela? Quand a-t-il dit cela? A qui a-t-il dit cela? Il a dit cela au philosophe? Il est. Qui est-il? Est-il philosophe? Non, il est voyageur. Où est-il? Est-il dans cet endroit-ci? Non, il est dans cet endroit-là. Où est Monsieur le philosophe? Monsieur le philosophe est à Paris. Quelle est cette personne-là? C'est un voyageur. Quelle est cette autre personne? C'est le philosophe. Il demande. Que demande-t-il? Il demande des richesses. Qui est-ce qui demande des richesses? C'est le philosophe. A qui demande-t-il des richesses? Pourquoi demande-t-il des richesses? Que demande ce voyageur-là? Il demande un endroit. Quel endroit demande-t-il? Il demande l'endroit où moururent les trois voyageurs. Il demande aussi son camarade. La personne qu'il demande est à Paris. Voilà un malheur. Voyez cette personne passant par là, c'est un philosophe. Voilà un voyageur de Paris. Voyez cet endroit-là. Voilà un malheur. Voici un autre malheur. Voici un voyageur. Voilà un autre voyageur. Cette personne-là est semblable à cette personne-ci. Ce philosophe-ci est semblable à celui-là. Quel malheur!

Que de malheurs ! Quelles richesses ! Quel philosophe ! Que de voyageurs ! Que de monde ! Que de manières ! Quel endroit ! Voilà des richesses ! Un des voyageurs dit à l'autre, " Nous avons faim, et il faut avoir de quoi manger qu'un de nous aille acheter de la viande."

" Est-ce un malheur d'avoir des richesses ?" dirent deux voyageurs qui moururent de faim. Un philosophe passant à l'endroit où les deux voyageurs mangeaient leur camarade, dit, " Voilà une manière de faire un repas. Les trois voyageurs dirent que leurs deux camarades moururent après avoir empoisonné un philosophe. " Nous avons du malheur," dirent deux voyageurs qui trouvèrent un philosophe dans leur chemin. " Il faut avoir de quoi manger," dit un philosophe, après avoir tué son camarade. " Nous avons de quoi manger," dirent les deux voyageurs, quand ils trouvèrent la viande empoisonnée. " Nous voilà empoisonnés !" dirent les deux voyageurs après avoir mangé la viande. " Que de richesses nous avons !" dirent les trois voyageurs quand ils trouvèrent le trésor. " Nous avons faim," dirent deux personnes quand ils mangèrent leur camarades. " Nous avons un trésor," dirent deux personnes quand ils trouvèrent un philosophe. " Qu'est-ce que les richesses ?" dit un passant, " voilà trois voyageurs qui trouvèrent un trésor et moururent de faim après. Le monde a traité les trois voyageurs de manière qu'ils moururent tous les trois." " Voilà une manière de faire," dit un philosophe quand le voyageur mit du poison dans la viande qu'il avait apportée à manger. " Il faut manger," dirent les deux voyageurs quand ils mangèrent leur camarade. " Nous voilà maîtres du trésor !" dirent les deux voyageurs après avoir tué leur camarade.

READING.

TEXT.

Instead of giving a fresh portion of text, we shall make what we have already given the subject of the present lesson. A few words well known, and a few leading principles thoroughly understood and firmly established on the memory, will be of more use to the learner than a vagrant notion of twenty times the number. The following is the text constituting the preceding lessons, united under one head, and with which the learner ought now to be quite as familiar as with his paternoster.

LES VOYAGEURS AVIDES.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor dans leur chemin. et dirent, "Nous avons faim, qu'un de nous aille acheter de quoi manger;" un d'eux se détacha et alla dans l'intention de leur apporter de quoi faire un repas.

Mais chemin faisant, il dit en lui-même, il faut que j'empoisonne la viande afin que mes deux camarades meurent en la mangeant, et que je jouisse du trésor moi seul. Il exécuta son dessein et mit du poison dans ce qu'il avait apporté à manger.

Mais les deux autres qui avaient conçu un semblable dessein contre lui pendant son absence, l'assassinèrent à son retour, et demeurèrent les maîtres du trésor. Après l'avoir tué ils mangèrent de la viande empoisonnée et moururent aussi tous deux.

Un philosophe passant par cet endroit-là, dit, voilà, quel est le monde! Voyez de quelle manière il a traité ces trois personnes. Malheur à celui qui lui demande des richesses.

CONVERSATION.

In addition to the words already introduced under this head, we shall, in the present colloquial exercise make use of the following new ones.

Mesdemoiselles, <i>young ladies</i> , pronounced <i>méd-ma-zel</i> .	
Y	there, " ee
En	{ of it, or, of them, about it, or about them, }
On	one, " on

From the translation we have already given in the text, of the word *dit*, the learner will be aware that *on dit* is word for word *one says*, but in translating a sentence he should not rest satisfied with a mere literal translation of the words, he should see whether some other English expression will not bring out the sense of the context with greater clearness. The sentence *on dit* is very much used in French, and the literal translation *one says* is scarcely English; some other kind of phraseology must therefore be employed in English in cases where *on dit* is employed in French, and it is the business of the learner to find these out. The other words of the phrase will generally suggest how *on dit* should be translated. The expressions *they say, people say, it is said*, will be frequently found the actual English equivalents for *on dit*. In the same way the learner will be aware that the phrase *on avait apporté de la viande*, is word for word, *one had brought of the meat*, but a moderate exertion of intelligence will suggest "Some meat had been brought," as the English translation of this phrase. When the words of a sentence are known, the learner should exercise his ingenuity in supplying the English for the French construction; by this means facility and accuracy in translation will eventually be acquired. We shall introduce abundantly the pronoun *on* in the following colloquy, in order to familiarize the learner with the use of the word, and habituate him to rely upon his own judgment in making English of an expression wherein it occurs.

The foregoing remarks are also applicable to the pronoun *y*, there; and to *en*, of them, or, of it; both of which are of very common occurrence in French. The word *en* has already appeared in the text, but in that case it is equivalent to the English word *in*. *En* has two perfectly

distinct significations; in one case it is a form of the Latin preposition *in*, and in the other is a contraction of the Latin word *inde*; in the first case it is equivalent to the English preposition *in*, and in the second it is a pronoun, and will have to be rendered by one or other of the expressions we have pointed out. The intelligent learner will always be able to judge by the words of the context whether *en* is a preposition or a pronoun, and it will be necessary for him to pay attention to this distinction in translating the word. We have said that *y* is equivalent to the English word *there*. The *y* is used exactly as the word *there*, in all cases where *there* indicates a place, with this difference, that *y* is always placed before a verb, whereas *there* is usually placed after one. Beside the common use of the *y*, in such phrases as *il y était*, he was there, an idiomatic use is made of the word, that requires to be noticed here. The French, to signify what is meant in English by the expression *there was*, say, it there had, *il y avait*; and in asking such a question as, "Was there so and so?" say *there had it* so and so? *y avait-il* so and so? This idiomatic construction will have to be borne in mind in going over the following exercise. The words *y*, *en*, and *on*, being much employed in French, it is necessary that their use and value be well understood. We have introduced them abundantly in our present colloquial exercise, because the subject of conversation being known, and all the other words, the learner will very easily find out the meaning of these three, and thus he will be able to detect for himself the principle that determines their use. A careful observation of the application we shall make of the *en*'s, *y*'s, and *on*'s, will greatly facilitate the learner in reading a French author, and will pave the way to a clear perception of the genius of the language.

Dit-on les trois voyageurs moururent à Paris?	Non, Mesdemoiselles,* on dit qu'ils moururent dans le chemin.
Dit-on qu'ils assassinèrent un philosophe?	Non, Mesdemoiselles, mais on dit qu'ils assassinèrent leur camarade.
Dit-on qu'ils avaient empoisonné leur camarade?	Non, Mesdemoiselles.
Les voyageurs mangèrent-ils de la viande empoisonnée?	Oui, ils en mangèrent.
En† moururent-ils?	Oui, ils en moururent.

* In addressing young ladies, the compliment *Mesdemoiselles* is always employed in French.

† It will be observed that *en* will be here better translated by *in consequence of that*, than by its simple equivalent of *it*.

- Qu'en dit un philosophe ? . . . Il dit, voilà comment le monde a traité ces personnes.
- Que trouvèrent les trois voyageurs dans le chemin ? Ils y trouvèrent un trésor.
- Qu'en dit l'un d'eux ? . . . Il dit, il faut que j'en jouisse seul.
- Combien des voyageurs y avait-il en chemin ? Trois.
- Y avait-il d'autres personnes ? Il y avait aussi un philosophe.
- Y avait-il un trésor dans le chemin ? Oui, il y en avait un.
- Y avait-il de quoi manger dans le chemin ? Non, mais on en avait apporté.
- Y avait-il de la viande dans ce qu'on avait apporté ? Oui, il y en avait.
- Dans quoi y avait-il du poison ? Il y en avait dans la viande qu'un de voyageurs avait apportée pour manger.
- De quoi mangèrent les voyageurs ? Ils mangèrent de la viande.
- Y avait-il du poison dans ce qu'ils avaient mangé ? Oui, il y en avait.
- Où dit-on qu'ils demeurèrent ? On dit qu'ils demeurèrent dans le chemin.
- Y trouvèrent-ils de quoi manger ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Y trouvèrent-ils un camarade ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Qu'y trouvèrent-ils ? . . . Ils y trouvèrent un trésor.
- Qu'y dirent-ils ? . . . Ils dirent nous avons faim, qu'un de nous aille acheter de quoi manger.
- Qui y assassinèrent-ils ? . . . Ils y assassinèrent un de leurs camarades.
- Qu'y mangèrent-ils ? . . . Ils y mangèrent de la viande.
- Dit-on qu'ils y moururent ? . . . Oui, on dit cela.
- Dit-on qu'ils moururent de faim ? Non, il y en eut un de tué et les deux autres moururent en mangeant de la viande empoisonnée.
- Qu'avaient les trois voyageurs en chemin ? Ils avaient faim.
- Qu'en dirent-ils ? . . . Ils dirent, qu'un de nous aille acheter de quoi manger.
- S'en détacha-t-il un dans cette intention ? Oui, un d'eux se détacha.
- Alla-t-il acheter de la viande ? Oui, il alla en acheter.
- Dit-on qu'il avait apporté de la viande ? Oui, on dit qu'il en avait apportée.
- Avait-il du poison ? . . . Oui, il en avait.
- Mit-il du poison dans la viande ? Oui, il en mit.
- Pourquoi ? . . . Afin que ses camarades mourussent en la mangeant.
- Combien de camarades avait-il ? Il en avait deux.

- Avait-on empoisonné les trois voyageurs ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Avait-on un trésor ? Oui, Mesdemoiselles, les trois voyageurs en trouvèrent un dans le chemin.
- Alla-t-on acheter de quoi manger ? Oui, on y* alla.
- Alla-t-on acheter de la viande ? Oui, on y alla.
- Alla-t-on manger un philosophe ? Mais non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Alla-t-on à Paris ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Dit-on que les trois voyageurs demeurèrent à Paris ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Dit-on que les trois voyageurs mangèrent un philosophe ? Mais non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Que dit-on qu'ils mangèrent ? On dit que les voyageurs mangèrent de la viande.
- Dit-on que le philosophe avait mis du poison dans la viande ? Non, mais on dit qu'un de leurs camarades l'avait empoisonnée.
- Avait-on faim ? Oui, les trois voyageurs avaient faim.
- Avait-on apporté de quoi manger ? Oui, le voyageur qui se détacha en avait apporté.
- Avait-on assassiné un voyageur ? Oui, les deux voyageurs avaient assassiné un de leurs camarades.
- Avait-on tué un philosophe ? Non, Mesdemoiselles.
- Comment le monde a-t-il traité les trois voyageurs ? De manière qu'ils moururent tous les trois.
- Qu'en dit un philosophe ? Il en dit, "Voilà, quel est le monde ! voyez de quelle manière il a traité ces trois personnes. Malheur à celui qui lui demande des richesses."
- En quel endroit dit-il cela ? Dans l'endroit où moururent les trois voyageurs.
- Exécuta-t-on un dessein ? Oui, le voyageur avait exécuté son dessein.
- Quel dessein exécuta-t-il ? Le dessein d'assassiner ses camarades.
- Comment l'exécuta-t-il ? Il acheta de la viande et y mit du poison.
- En mangea-t-il lui-même ? Non, il apporta le tout à ses camarades.
- Pendant son absence où demeurèrent les deux autres ? Ils demeurèrent en chemin.
- Quand il apporta la viande empoisonnée qui en mangea ? Ses deux camarades.
- En moururent-ils ? Oui, ils moururent après l'avoir mangée.

* It will be observed that *y* here has rather the signification of *for that purpose*, than its primitive signification *there*.

Les trois voyageurs moururent-ils tous ? Oui, ils moururent tous.

Où moururent les trois voyageurs ? Dans l'endroit où ils trouvèrent le trésor.

CONSTRUCTION.

XX.

Trois voyageurs trouvèrent un trésor	Three travellers found a treasure.
Ils dirent	'They said.
Ils meurent	'They may die.
Ils l'assassinèrent	'They assassinated him.
Ils demeurèrent	'They remained.
Ils mangèrent	'They ate.
Ils moururent	'They died.

It will be observed that these verbs are all of the third person plural, that they all end in *ent* ; and if the learner has been attending to the pronunciation, he will be aware that this *ent* is not pronounced in any of them. If we inquire whence comes this *ent*, and wherefore it is not pronounced, we must go back a century or two in the history of the language in order to find the cause. In the Latin language, of which French is nothing more than a barbarous dialect, the third person plural of all tenses of verbs end in *ent*, or *nt* preceded by some other vowel : this *ent* in Latin is equivalent to the English pronoun *they*, and to the French *ils*. The Franks, when they got possession of Gaul, preferred expressing themselves when speaking in the third person, by a pronoun, and as they do not appear to have paid the smallest respect to Latin grammar, dropped the *ent* altogether, having found that they could make themselves perfectly understood without it. The Latin termination, however, continued to exist in the written language even although its equivalent *ils* had been introduced, and thus a solecism was created, and exists in the language.

It may be some consolation for an Englishman to know, that while his own language is yet in a state demi-savage, there are also barbarisms in languages that boast a higher degree of civilization. The French can not, any more than the English, declare itself an independent language ; it is still a "motley clown," one half belonging to the transalpine conquerors of Gaul, and the other half to the Goths and Vandals from beyond the Rhine. From the one it has got its personal endings, and from

the other the habit of using subsidiary words ; in continuing to use both in defiance of logic and grammatical analogy, the French only perpetuate a monument of their double subserviency.

The learner must bear in mind that though *ent* is written at the end of all the third persons plural of verbs, it is never pronounced.

XXI.

FORMATION OF A NEGATION

The English negative particle *not* is rendered in French by the two words *ne* and *pas*, the *ne* being placed before the word negated, and the *pas* after it ; in this way the affirmative, *ils trouvèrent un trésor*, *they found a treasure*, forms the negative, *ils ne trouvèrent pas de trésor*, *they did not find a treasure* ; and so in the case of all other negatives.

When *ne* comes before a word beginning with a vowel, the *e* is elided, as from the affirmative *c'est*, it is, is formed the negative

Ce n'est pas . . . It is not.

In asking a question with a negative, the *ne* is then placed before the simple interrogation itself, and the *pas* at the end of it ; as from the interrogation *est-ce ?* is it ? is formed the negative interrogation

N'est-ce pas ? . . . Is it not ?

We may here observe that this particular interrogation, this *n'est-ce pas* (pronounced *nes-pa*), is very often used in asking questions. It is of universal application, and, on being put to the end of any affirmative, forms an interrogative.

The following examples will show the use and application of *n'est-ce pas* :

Vous avez le trésor <i>n'est-ce pas ?</i>	You have the treasure, <i>have you not ?</i>
Nous avons faim, <i>n'est-ce pas ?</i>	We are hungry, <i>are we not ?</i>
Ils mangèrent leur camarade, <i>n'est-ce pas ?</i>	They ate their companion, <i>did they not ?</i>
Il alla à Paris, <i>n'est-ce pas ?</i>	He went to Paris, <i>did he not ?</i>

We shall introduce a series of negatives under the head COMPOSITION, for the practice of the learner in their construction.

XXII.

Ils demeurèrent LES maîtres du trésor.	They remained masters of the treasure.
--	--

In English the use of the definite article *the* is subject to greater exactitude than in French ; *the* is only used in English when some special object or objects are alluded to ; but in French, as may be observed by the phrase before us, the definite article is used even although no definition is signified. "When the two travellers killed their companion, they remained masters of the treasure ;" there is certainly no necessity for saying here, "they remained *the* masters of the treasure." In French, however, an article of some kind or other is used before almost every noun ; this appears to be done in order more to point out its gender than to serve any other purpose. We have already said (§ XI.) that nouns sometimes have a different meaning when they have the feminine article *la* before them, than when they are distinguished by the masculine article ; hence the article is used in French in many instances where it is totally unnecessary as an instrument of definition, and consequently would not be employed in English. In most of the French grammars we have seen, a large portion is taken up in explaining the use of the article in French, in which the authors generally contrive to embarrass themselves, and create a complication of difficulties where there is absolutely nothing but the utmost simplicity, the article being used in French on all occasions that it possibly can be used. We have seen a large octavo volume written on this one subject, and we think the author merits the pillory for his pains ; not only because he has thereby confounded and misled all his brother grammarians, but because he has led people who have no means of knowing better, to suppose that there is a difficulty where none exists, and so to waste, in hunting after a shadow, the time that might be profitably employed.

PRONUNCIATION.

VOWELS.

There are in French, as in English, the five vowels, a, e, i, o, u. Of these we have already given (page 26, lesson second), the pronunciation of the u ; and page 39, lesson third, that of the e. The other three are pronounced in French as follows :—

a is pronounced like <i>a</i> in the English word <i>part</i> .				
i	"	ee	"	seen.
o	"	o	"	stone.

Besides these, there is the letter *y*, usually considered in both lan-

guages to be a vowel. *Y* is pronounced in French exactly like the *i*, that is, like *ee* in the English word *seen*; but when *y* occurs between two vowels, it then becomes equivalent to two *i*'s; for example, the word *voyageurs* is pronounced as if written *voiiageurs*; the first of the *i*'s in conjunction with the *o* forms the diphthong *oi*, pronounced as we have said *wa*, and the second *i* having its own sound makes up the pronunciation (*wa-ee-a-shair*) we have given of the word in the text. Each of the English vowels has two or three sounds, some of which are enjoyed in common by all the five, but no such confusion exists in the French language. Each of the French vowels has the one particular sound we have assigned to it, which must always be given to it in order that the word in which it occurs may be intelligibly pronounced. Nothing therefore can be more easily attained than a correct pronunciation of the French vowels, and yet we know that it is frequently a long time before the learner accomplishes this part of his task. We have said that the letter *a* has the sound of *a* in the English word *part*, but this is not the most common English sound of that vowel. An Englishman, when he meets with an *a* in a word whose pronunciation he is unacquainted with, will naturally give it the sound of *a* in *made*. The French *a* never has, under any circumstances, such a sound; and if this sound be given to the *a*, the meaning of the word in which it is so pronounced will be totally obscured. These remarks are applicable to the other vowels. The natural predilections of the learner will lead him to pronounce them all inaccurately, he must therefore endeavor to associate the French vowels with their French sounds. To effect this, he should again go over the words of the text, and pronounce all the *a*'s that do not form a part of one or other of the five diphthongs, like *a* in the English words *part*, *start*, *dart*; all the *i*'s like *ee* in the English words *seen*, *been*, *green*; all the *o*'s like *o* in *stone*, *gone*, *bone*. This exercise will serve to impress on the memory a fixed notion of the sounds peculiar to the French vowels, that will be of the greatest use to him in his future intercourse with the language.

CONSONANTS.

Singles.

With the following five exceptions, and the nasal sound given to the *m* and *n* already spoken of, the consonants are pronounced in French precisely as they are in English.

1st. The letter *g* in French before *e*, *i*, and *y*, is pronounced like the *z* in *azure*, as *voyageur*, pronounced *voyazhair*. The letter *j* is always so pronounced, as *jour*, day, pronounced *zhoor*. The learner is requested

to pay attention to these sounds of the *j* and *g*, as these letters are pronounced in English in a very different manner.

2d. When *s* or *x* occur between two vowels, they are pronounced in French like *z* in the English word *zone*, as *empoisonner*, to poison, pronounced *empoisonné*.

3d. The letter *t* before *i* is generally pronounced like *s*, as in the word *intention*, pronounced *in-ten-see-on*.

4th. The letter *r* has always the vibrating sound er-r-r of the English word *term*.

5th. The letters *gu* are pronounced like *g* in the English word *get*, as in the word *guerre*, war, pronounced *ger*, giving the *g* the hard sound. And in the same way *qu* are pronounced like *k*, as in the word *qui*, who, pronounced *kee*; *quel*, what, pronounced *kel*; *question*, pronounced *kes-tee-on*, &c.

These five observations should be read over two or three times, so that they may be well fixed on the memory, as they are essential to a correct pronunciation.

The most marked feature in the pronunciation of French is, that a consonant at the end of a word is silent. No final consonants are pronounced except *r*, which is also silent at the end of *manger*, to eat, pronounced *mangé*; *tuer*, to kill, pronounced *tué*, and other infinitives of the first conjugation. This peculiarity presents little difficulty, the learner has only to cut off the concluding consonant of each word before pronouncing it; thus he will pronounce *trois*, *trwa*, *voyageurs*, *wa-ee-a-geur*, and so with all other words ending in a consonant.* When, however, there is a close connexion between two words, such as exists between a verb and its pronoun, one of which ends in a consonant and the other begins with a vowel, the final consonant is then pronounced with the vowel that follows it; as,

Nous avons	pronounced	noo-zavon.
Faut-il	"	fo-teel.
Son absence	"	so-nab-sens.

We have already remarked, under the head CONSTRUCTION, § XX., that *ent* of the third persons plural of verbs is also silent; the *t* when followed by a vowel is however enunciated, as *mangèrent-ils*, pronounced *mangèr-teel*. This will be better understood by referring to CONSTRUCTION, § VI.

* There are a few words of which the final consonant is pronounced; these the student will become better acquainted with as he progresses in the language.

Doubles.

Besides the sounds represented by the single consonants, there are two others used in French, represented by double consonants, these are the liquid *ng* and the *l* mouillé. When *ng* occur between two vowels, these letters are pronounced like *ny* in English ; as,

La campagne	pronounced	la cam-pan-ye.
Boulogne	"	Boo-lon-ye.

enunciating the *ye* very slightly. When two *ll*'s occur after *i*, followed by another vowel, they are pronounced like *y*, as in the word *fille*, *girl*, pronounced *fee-ye*. In conclusion we may add, that if the learner has followed up attentively what we have said in this and the four preceding lessons, he is now capable, so far as the pronunciation is concerned, of reading French. There are here and there exceptions to the rules we have laid down, but these will become known to the learner as he proceeds. Once familiar with the broad principles and leading feature of the pronunciation of a language, and the minute detail will be no obstacle ; the learner's own observation and judgment will tell him when a rule may be judiciously departed from.

COMPOSITION.

The traveller is not at Paris.
Is he not in France ?
No, he is not in France.
Where is the treasure ?
Is it not on the road ?
No, it is not there.
The philosopher is not rich.
Has he not the treasure ?
No, he has not the treasure.
The masters of the treasure had
nothing to eat.
Had they no meat ?
No, they had none.
You have (vous avez).
You have eaten your companion,
have you not ?
You have killed a philosopher, have
you not ?
You have the treasure, have you
not ?
You are hungry, are you not ?

You have wherewithal to eat, have
you not ?
Have you nothing to eat ?
Are you not hungry ?
Have you not the treasure ?
Have you not the meat ?
The travellers did not find a treas-
ure.
They did not eat their companion.
They did not not poison any other
traveller.
They did not bring anything to eat.
They did not go to Paris.
They did not pass into France.
They did not live on the road.
They did not buy any meat.
They did not kill any philosopher.
They did not assassinate any one.
They did not seek riches.
They did not execute their inten-
tion.

They did not separate themselves.
 They did not die.
 They did not conceive a design.
 They did not say, "We are hungry."
 They did not enjoy the treasure.
 They did not put any poison in the meat.
 They did not make any repast.
 They did not see any philosopher.
 The traveller did not find a treasure.
 He did not eat his companion.
 He did not poison any other traveller.
 He did not bring anything to eat.
 He did not go to Paris.
 He did not go into France.
 He did not remain on the road.
 He did not buy any meat.
 He did not kill a philosopher.
 He did not assassinate anybody.
 He did not seek for riches.
 He did not execute his intention.
 He did not separate himself from his companions.
 He did not die.
 He did not conceive a design.

He did not say that a philosopher is an evil.
 He did not put any poison in the meat.
 He did not enjoy the treasure.
 He did not see any other traveller.
 He did not make a repast.
 No one found a treasure on the road.
 No one brought any meat there.
 No one ate any.
 No one bought any.
 No one lived on the road.
 No one killed a philosopher there.
 No one assassinated a traveller there.
 No one executed an intention there.
 Were the three travellers not eaten?
 No, they were not eaten.
 They are dead (ils sont morts), are they not?
 Yes, they are dead.
 That is a pity, is it not?
 Yes, it is a pity.
 Are all the three travellers dead?
 Yes, they are all dead.
 Good-by (adieu) to the three travellers.

LESSON SIXTH.

READING.

REPETITION.

LE voyageur n'est pas à Paris. Est-ce qu'il n'est pas en France? Non, il n'est pas en France. Où est le trésor? N'est-ce pas dans le chemin? Non, ce n'est pas là. Le philosophe n'a pas de richesses. N'a-t-il pas le trésor? Non, il n'a pas le trésor. Les maîtres du trésor n'avaient pas de quoi manger. N'avaient-ils pas de la viande? Non, ils n'en avaient pas. Vous avez. Vous avez mangé votre camarade, n'est-ce pas? Vous avez tué un philosophe, n'est-ce pas? Vous avez le trésor, n'est-ce pas? Vous avez faim, n'est-ce pas? Vous avez de quoi manger, n'est-ce pas? N'avez-vous pas de quoi manger? N'avez-vous pas faim? N'avez-vous pas le trésor? N'avez-vous pas de viande? Les voyageurs ne trouvèrent pas un trésor. Ils ne mangèrent pas leur camarade. Ils n'empoisonnèrent pas d'autre voyageur. Ils n'apportèrent pas de quoi manger. Ils n'allèrent pas à Paris. Ils ne passèrent pas en France. Ils ne demeurèrent pas dans le chemin. Ils n'achetèrent pas de viande. Ils ne tuèrent pas le philosophe. Ils n'assassinèrent personne. Ils ne demandèrent pas de richesses. Ils n'exécutèrent pas leur intention. Ils ne se détachèrent pas les uns des autres. Ils ne moururent pas. Ils ne conçurent pas un dessein. Ils ne dirent pas nous avons faim. Ils ne jouirent pas du trésor. Ils ne mirent pas de poison dans la viande. Ils ne firent pas de repas. Ils ne virent pas de philosophe. Le voyageur ne trouva pas un trésor. Il ne mangea pas son camarade. Il n'empoisonna pas d'autre voyageur. Il n'apporta pas de quoi manger.

Il n'alla pas à Paris. Il ne passa pas en France. Il ne demeura pas dans le chemin. Il n'acheta pas de viande. Il ne tua pas un philosophe. Il n'assassina personne. Il ne demanda pas de richesses. Il n'exécuta pas son intention. Il ne se détacha pas de ses camarades. Il ne mourut pas. Il ne conçut pas un dessein. Il ne dit pas qu'un philosophe est un malheur. Il ne mit pas de poison dans la viande. Il ne jouit pas du trésor. Il ne vit pas d'autre voyageur. Il ne fit pas de repas. On n'a pas trouvé un trésor dans le chemin. On n'y a pas apporté de viande. On n'en a pas mangé. On n'en a pas acheté. On n'est pas demeuré dans le chemin. On n'y a pas tué de philosophe. On n'y a pas assassiné de voyageur. On n'y a pas exécuté de dessein. Est-ce qu'on n'a pas mangé les trois voyageurs? Non, on ne les a pas mangés. Ils sont morts, n'est-ce pas? Oui, ils sont morts. C'est un malheur, n'est-ce pas? Oui, c'est un malheur. Est-ce que tous les voyageurs sont morts? Oui, ils sont morts tous. Adieu, aux trois voyageurs.

IDIOMS.

An acquaintance with a few of the common-place phrases of every-day use will be found of considerable utility to the student of a modern language. These phrases, in general, involve the most idiomatic constructions of the language, and may aid the learner in comprehending other expressions of a similar nature, but of less frequent occurrence. Besides, if the learner has any intercourse at all with persons who speak the language, he will hear these phrases so often repeated that they cannot fail of becoming familiar to his ear, and so he will ultimately arrive at understanding a part at least of what is said. To charge the mind, however, with a multitude of these phrases would not be advisable; a single phrase, if properly handled, might be turned to as much account as a whole book of "Dialogues." Suppose, for example, the learner to put in French, to a native of France, the question "What do you call *this* in French?" he might by this means elicit the whole vocabulary of the language, and carry on a colloquy of as much practical utility as a more extended con-

versation. Again, supposing the learner on the other side of the Channel, the phrase "Which is the way to——?" would elicit an indefinite variety of reply that would be readily understood by the querist. The learner might in this manner get familiarized with the realities of the language, even while his knowledge of it were limited to the two phrases we have been speaking of. All the benefit that a beginner could possibly derive from a teacher is an early induction to the practice of a language, but how few teachers of French possess the art of making themselves understood to their junior pupils in French! Their lessons for the most part consist in illogical explanations, and commonly in so very bad English as to excite laughter—how the ear of the student can be familiarized with the French language by such means we cannot possibly conceive. We shall give for the present reading exercise a series of such familiar everyday expressions as we may consider most likely to be of practical utility. Of these we shall give the English equivalents, together with the value of each individual word. There is no necessity for us giving the pronunciation of these phrases, as the learner who has carefully attended to our remarks in the preceding lessons, can now pronounce French perfectly well. We shall, however, point out any peculiarity in the pronunciation of the words that is not in accordance with the principles we have laid down.

INTRODUCTORY PHRASES.

Parlez*-vous Français ?	Do you speak French ?
Un peu	A little.
Je comprends le Français, mais je ne le parle pas.	I understand French, but do not speak it.
Vous êtes† Français, je pense, Monsieur ?	You are a Frenchman, I suppose, Sir ?
Oui Monsieur, je le suis	Yes Sir, I am.
Combien de temps‡ êtes-vous resté en Angleterre ?§	How long have you been in Eng- land ?
Aimez-vous beaucoup Londres ?	How do you like London ?

* We have said that final consonants are not pronounced when the silent consonant is preceded by an unaccented *e*, that letter is pronounced as if written *é*, thus *parlez* is pronounced as if written *parlé*; *aimez*, as if written *aimé*; *répéter*, *répété*; and so in all similar cases.

† The word *êtes*, *are*, is exceptional, the unaccented *e* not being pronounced; *êtes* is pronounced as if written *ét*.

‡ When the letters *p*, *d*, or *t*, occur after a nasal, they are usually silent, as in the word *comprends* pronounced *comprang*, *temps* pronounced *tang*. This is because these consonants cannot be easily pronounced after the nasal. It is for the same reason that *l* is silent before *k*, in the English words *walk*, *talk*, etc.

§ An unaccented *e* before two consonants pronounced as if written *è*, thus *Angleterre* is pronounced *Angletèr*; *richesses*, as if written *richès*; and so on.

Vous m'obligeriez si vous me parliez Français.	You will oblige me if you speak French.
Je vous comprends parfaitement bien.	I understand you perfectly well.
Excusez-moi	I beg your pardon.
Je n'ai pas compris ce que vous m'avez dit.	I have not understood what you have said.
Seriez-vous assez bon pour répéter ce que vous avez dit ?	Will you be kind enough to repeat what you have said ?
Fumez-vous ?	Do you smoke ?
Voulez-vous un cigare ? . . .	Will you have a cigar ?
Avec plaisir	With pleasure.
Merci	Thank you.

RECOGNITORY.

Bon jour, Monsieur	Good morning, Sir.
Comment vous portez-vous ? . .	How do you do ?
Assez bien, et vous ?	Pretty well thank you.
Je suis charmé de vous voir . . .	I am delighted to see you
Il fait une superbe matinée . . .	It is a beautiful morning.
Il fait vraiment chaud*	It is excessively warm.
Il fait beau depuis quelques jours .	The weather has been very fine for some time.
C'est vrai	It is true.
Y a-t-il quelque chose de nouveau ?	Is there any thing new ?
Rien, que je sache	Nothing, that I know.
Quand viendrez-vous me voir ? . .	When are you coming to see me ?
Un de ces jours	One of these days.
Messieurs, je vous souhaite le bon soir.	Gentlemen, I wish you a very good evening.
Adieu, Messieurs	Good-by, Gentlemen.

GENERAL.

Quelle heure est-il ?	What o'clock is it ?
A peu près huit heures†	About eight.
Est-ce bien vrai ?	Is it true ?
Je le pense	I think so.
Je suis occupé	I am busy.
J'ai tort	I am wrong.
Vous avez raison	You are right.
Précisément	Exactly.
Monsieur, ayez la bonté de me dire—	Have the goodness to tell me sir—
Comment appelez-vous cela en Français ?	What do you call that in French ?

* *Ch*, in French, is, except in a few words derived from the Greek, pronounced like *sh*, thus the words *charmé* is pronounced as if written *sharmé* ; *chaud*, *sho*.

† An *s*, added to a word to indicate the plural number does not affect in any way its pronunciation, *heure*, hour, and *heures*, hours, are pronounced exactly in the same manner ; the learner must take care always to pronounce a plural word by its singular form.

J'y suis	I am coming.
Quelle bêtise	What nonsense.
Quelle je suis bête	What an ass I am.
Cela est bon	'That is good.
Je ne sais pas	I do not know.
Le croyez-vous?	Do you think so?
Oui, je le crois	Yes, I do.

ENGLISH GALLICISMS.

A la Française	After the French.
Honi* soit qui mal y pense . . .	Evil to him who evil thinks
Dieu et mon droit	God and my right.
Cuisine bourgeoise†	Family cookery.
'Table d'hôte à cinq heures . . .	An ordinary at five o'clock.
Au bon gourmet	Go to the good eater.
Dejeuners à la fourchette . . .	Beef-steak breakfasts.
Fête-champêtre	A pic-nic.
Ici on parle Français	French spoken here.
Voulez-vous me donner la monnaie de cinq francs?	Can you change a five-franc piece?
Que voulez-vous?	What do you want?
Comprenez-vous l'Anglais? . . .	Do you understand English?
Je ne parle pas Français	I do not speak French.
Je suis Anglais	I am an Englishman.
Vive la reine	God save the Queen.

TRANSLATION.

The following is a literal translation of the phrases, giving the exact English equivalent for each French word contained in them.

INTRODUCTORY PHRASES.

Parlez-vous Français?	Un peu.	Je comprends le Français,
Speak you French?	A little.	I understand the French,
mais je ne le parle pas.	Vous êtes Français, je pense,	
but I it speak not.	You are French, I think,	
Monsieur?	Oui, Monsieur, je le suis.	Combien de temps
Sir?	Yes, Sir, I it am.	How much of time

* The French like the English, have a natural abhorrence to aspirates and gutturals; for this reason, nearly all the *h*'s in the language are silent, consequently when an *h* is followed by a vowel, the word is considered to begin a vowel, and the rule we have given (§ II.), relative to elision of certain letters before words beginning with a vowel, is applicable to them also. There are however some words in the language, such as *honi*, of which the *h* is aspirated: these are usually written in italics in the Dictionaries, and should be committed to memory by the learner.

† The *e* mute is inserted after the *g* in this word, to show that the *g* is soft, just as an *e* is sometimes inserted after the *g* in the English word *acknowledgment*, for the same purpose.

êtes-vous resté en Angleterre ? Aimez-vous beaucoup Londres ?
 are you rested in England ? Love you much London ?
 Vous m'obligeriez, si vous me parliez Français. Je vous
 You me would oblige, if you to me speak French. I you
 comprends parfaitement bien. Excusez-moi. Je n'ai pas
 understand perfectly well. Excuse me. I have not
 compris ce que vous m'avez dit. Seriez-vous assez bon
 understood what you to me have said. Would be you enough good
 pour répéter ce que vous avez dit ? Fumez-vous ? Voulez-
 for to repeat what you have said ? Smoke you ? Will (have)
 vous un cigare ? Avec plaisir. Merci.
 you a cigar ? With pleasure. Thanks.

RECOGNITORY.

Bon jour, Monsieur. Comment vous portez-vous ? Assez,
 Good day, Sir. How yourself carry you ? Enough
 bien, et vous ? Je suis charmé de vous voir. Il fait
 well, and you ? I am charmed of you to see. It makes (is)
 une superbe matinée. Il fait vraiment chaud. Il fait
 a superb morning. It makes (is) truly warm. It makes
 beau depuis quelques jours. C'est vrai. Y a-t-il quelque
 fine for some days. That is true. There has it (is there) any
 chose de nouveau ? Rien, que je sache. Quand viendrez-
 thing of new ? Nothing, that I know. When will come
 vous me voir ? Un de ces jours. Messieurs, je vous
 you me to see ? One of these days. Gentlemen, I you
 souhaite le bon soir. Adieu, Messieurs.
 wish the good evening. Adieu, Gentlemen.

GENERAL.

Quelle heure est-il ? A peu près huit heures. Est-ce
 What hour is it ? Almost eight hours. Is that
 bien vrai ? Je le pense. Je suis occupé. J'ai tort.
 well (very) true ? I it think. I am busy. I have (am) wrong.
 Vous avez raison. Précisément. Monsieur, ayez la bonté
 You have right. Exactly. Sir, have the goodness
 de me dire. Comment appelez-vous cela en Français ? J'
 of to me to tell. How call you that in French ? I
 y suis. Quelle bêtise. Que je suis bête. Cela est
 there am. What nonsense. What I am beast. That is
 bon. Je ne sais pas. Le croyez-vous ? Oui, je le
 good. I know not. It believe you ? Yes, I it
 crois.
 believe.

ENGLISH GALLICISMS.

A la Française. Honi soit qui mal y pense.* Dieu
 To (after) the French. Ashamed be (he) who evil there thinks. God
 et mon droit. Cuisine bourgeoise. Table d'hôte à cinq
 and my right. Cookery bourgeoise.† Table of guest at five
 heures. Au bon gourmet. Dejeuners à la fourchette
 hours. To the (go) good eater. Breakfasts to (with) the fork.
 Fête-champêtre. Ici on parle Français.
 Holiday-field. Here one speaks French.

LOCAL.

Madame, j'ai l'honneur de vous présenter mes salutations.
 Madame, I have the honor of to you to present my salutations.
 Monsieur, veuillez recevoir les miennes. Est-ce la le chemin
 Sir, will to receive the mine. Is that there the road
 de Paris? Voulez-vous m'indiquer la rue St. Honoré? Combien
 of Paris? Will you to me indicate the street St. Honore? How much
 la douzaine? Un franc.‡ Ils sont chers. Voulez-vous me
 the dozen? A franc. They are dear. Will you to me
 donner la monnaie de cinq francs? Que voulez-vous? Comprenez-
 to give the change of five francs? What will you? Understand
 vous l'Anglais? Je ne parle pas Français. Je suis Anglais.
 you the English? I speak not French. I am English.
 Vive la reine. Garçon du café. Quels vins avez-vous?
 Live the queen. Waiter of the (some) coffee. What wines have you?
 Apportez-moi une bouteille de Maçon.¶ Un petit verre de
 Bring me a bottle of Macon. A little glass of
 Cognac. Servez-moi des côtelettes de mouton. Donnez-moi une
 brandy. Bring me of the ribs of sheep. Give me an
 omelette.§ Monsieur, voulez-vous me passer le pain, s'il vous
 omelette. Sir, will you to me pass the bread, if it to you
 plait.
 pleases.

* *Vide* Order of the Garter.

† This is one of the words that it is difficult to find an exact equivalent for in English. Its meaning in the phrase before us, however, is evident enough: it clearly indicates that the cookery in question has all the exuberance, without the refinement, of *res in urbe*.

‡ A franc is a current silver coin equivalent to 20 sous.

§ Macon is a wine similar in flavor to Burgundy, and is a *vin ordinaire* very commonly used in the *restaurants* and *cafés* of Paris. In price it varies from 7½d. to 15d. a bottle.

¶ *Une omelette* will generally be found the most satisfactory dish that can be had at a road-side *auberge* in France.

PRONUNCIATION.

SUMMARY.

Under this head, in the five preceding lessons, we have comprised all the leading principles of the pronunciation of the French language. In summing up our observations on this subject, we have to remark, that there is an order to be followed in the pronunciation of the letters making up a word, that requires attention. In pronouncing a word, it is usual to begin at the first letter, and to go on spelling the others in succession to the end; this process must, however, be slightly departed from in pronouncing the French words. We have said that there are certain combinations of letters used to represent single sounds, it follows, therefore, that the single letters composing these combinations must not be enunciated individually. Again, of these combinations the nasal sound takes the precedence in pronunciation of all others; for example, we have said that *ai* is pronounced like *ai* in the word *paid*, according to that rule the *ai* of the word *faim* should be so pronounced; but this is not the case, the *im* is of necessity nasal, and when the nasal syllable is deducted from the word *faim*, the diphthong *ai* no longer exists, the syllable *fa* only remains, and the *fa* blending with the nasal *im* makes the pronunciation *fin* we have given of the word *faim* in the text. The nasal syllable must always in the same way go for its full value in a word, and it is only after the nasal syllable has been allowed its rights, that the other letters can claim theirs. We may here remind the learner, that *m* and *n* are pronounced exactly as in English, when followed by another *m* or *n*, or a vowel, as in the words *honneur*, *honor*, *fumer*, *to smoke*; but under all other circumstances these letters combine with the vowel that precedes, and form the nasal syllable. When more than one vowel occur in a syllable, the learner must see that they do not involve one or other of the five diphthongs, before pronouncing them singly: in the word *beaux*, *fine*, for example, we have the diphthong *au*, which is pronounced *o*, then the consonant *x* being final, and the *e* unaccented, the pronunciation of this word is in consequence simply *bó*.

In conclusion, we have to say that, if the learner has followed up our instructions attentively, he is capable of pronouncing French correctly; he will be more or less accurate, according to the degree of stability the different points illustrated have obtained upon his memory. The first of the series of phrases given as a reading exercise in the present lesson, is "Parlez-vous Français?" if our observations are fresh upon

his memory, the learner will know that *p* is one of the consonants pronounced in French as in English, that *a* has always the sound of *a* in the English word part, that *r* has always its vibrating sound, that *l* is another of the consonants pronounced as in English, that *z* being final is silent, and that in consequence the *e* mute preceding it is pronounced *é*; that *v* is pronounced as in English, that *ou* is one of the five diphthongs, that *s* being final and not followed by another word beginning with a vowel, is silent, that *fr* are pronounced as in English, that *an* is one of the five nasals, that *ç* with a cedilla is pronounced like *s*, that *ai* is one of the five diphthongs, and finally, that *s*, being final, is silent. Our observations providing for all the exigencies of pronunciation, with a very few unimportant exceptions, the learner may in this way analyze all the words of the language, and by this process he will acquire more speedily, a much more accurate and an infinitely more permanent notion of the French pronunciation, than he could possibly obtain from a teacher.

Any one wishing to have the French alphabet, may construct one by taking an English A. B. C., striking out the *w*, and naming the letters *ah*, *bay*, *say*, instead of *ai*, *bee*, *see*. This however can serve no useful purpose; some advantage might be derived from constructing a table of the sounds, arranged in the order we have pointed out. This table should begin with the five nasals, as being the first sounds in order of importance in pronunciation, and should conclude with the observations we have given in the notes to the text of the present lesson.

HOW THE LEARNER SHOULD PROCEED.

We have given some general views of the construction of the French language. We have shown how words being known, they may be made of use in practice. We have shown how questions are put, and answered. We have explained the manner of expressing a negative, and we have exhibited the chief idiomatic difficulties of the language. We have also given such a view of the pronunciation, as will serve the learner for every practical purpose. He must now follow up our instructions by a diligent and careful course of reading; we would suggest for this purpose Gil Blas, which is by far the best author for the beginner's perusal, both as regards the style and the diction. Before however he can read this, he will require to make himself acquainted with the desinenes of the French verb. We are sorry that the limits we have prescribed for our present course of lessons will not admit of our giving a satisfactory analysis of the verb. The learner must therefore in this matter have recourse to one

or other of the common Grammars. He must make himself familiar with what are called the four regular conjugations, to one or other of which series of changes most of the verbs in the language are subject. He must then write twice over, in full, all the verbs that are not in accordance with either of these conjugations. This done, with the aid of a good Dictionary, the learner will find little difficulty in translating Gil Blas. He will very soon be able to dispense with the dictionary, and on arriving at this point his task will be well nigh accomplished; once able to read a French author, a month or two in France will do the rest. We have spoken of nearly all the difficulties the self-instructor has to encounter, none of them are of so formidable a character that a little intelligence will not suffice to overcome. We are satisfied that a little perseverance, exerted in the manner pointed out, will put the learner who has attentively gone over our lessons in possession of a more accurate knowledge of the language than is ever attained by persons who have acquired it by means of oral instruction.

FINIS.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 117 642 6